UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE SPECTER OF THE FACE.
READING PHYSIOGNOMY, POWER, AND THE ARTIST-FIGURE IN MODERN GERMAN-LANGUAGE PROSE WORKS.
LAVATER – CHAMISSO – MÖRIKE – STIFTER – TH. MANN

BY

JOHN L. PLEWS ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

GERMANIC LANGUAGES, LITERATURES, AND LINGUISTICS

DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES AND CULTURAL STUDIES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 2001

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-68983-2

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

LIBRARY RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: JOHN L. PLEWS

TITLE OF THESIS: THE SPECTER OF THE FACE. READING PHYSIOGNOMY, POWER, AND THE ARTIST-FIGURE IN MODERN GERMAN-LANGUAGE PROSE WORKS. LAVATER – CHAMISSO – MÖRIKE – STIFTER – TH. MANN

DEGREE: DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: FALL 2001

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

11306–96TH STREET
EDMONTON AB
CANADA T5G 1T3

JUNE 25, 2001

> "Was wir Ihnen diesmal zeigen,
> ist nichts anderes, als ein Schattenspiel."
>
> Eduard Mörike, *Maler Nolten*

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled The Specter of the Face. Reading Physiognomy, Power, and the Artist-Figure in Modern German-Language Prose Works. Lavater – Chamisso – Mörike – Stifter – Th. Mann submitted by John L. Plews in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Germanic Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics.

Dr. Raleigh Whitinger (Supervisor)

Dr. Marianne Henn

Dr. Garrett P. J. Epp

Dr. Uri Margolin

Dr. Christine McWebb

(for) Dr. Lynne Tatlock (External Examiner)

Friday, June 22, 2001

DEDICATION

NAN

ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores Johann Caspar Lavater's reinvention of physiognomy and the construction of the face in select German-language prose from the late eighteenth century to the early twentieth century. For this purpose it is divided into a three-part Introduction followed by four analytical chapters and the Conclusion.

The Introduction discusses Lavater's physiognomical treatises in light of the cultural theories of Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu. I situate Lavater's work at the cusp of the classical episteme as it anticipates the shift to the modern episteme, and demonstrate how Lavater's use of physiognomy confirms his cultural prejudice and shores up his cultural authority or symbolic power. I argue that Lavater uses physiognomy as an ideological apparatus for expressing entitlement especially of cultural producers, and not as an index of the mind. The Introduction also offers brief analyses of works by Ludwig Tieck, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, E. T. A. Hoffmann, and Eduard Mörike.

Chapters One through Four analyze the presence, influence, and effects of physiognomical discourse and the appropriation of the face as a mode of representation in Adelbert von Chamisso's *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte*, Eduard Mörike's *Maler Nolten*, Adalbert Stifter's *Der Nachsommer*, and Thomas Mann's *Der Tod in Venedig*. I demonstrate the importance of physiognomy and physiognomical sentiment in these works for asserting the knowledge of an

individual character's place in society and especially for the formation of, or for a protagonist's integration into, a cultural elite. I show how these works do not treat physiognomy uncritically, but rather criticize precisely the cultural system that they, on the surface, appear to reproduce. I discuss how the culture industry's involvement in physiognomy is revealed in these novels to be primarily designed to safeguard the social makeup and interests of a cultural community founded on restrictive presuppositions of sexuality, gender, race, and class.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincerest thanks to my supervisor Dr. Raleigh Whitinger for his expert guidance, thoughtful advice, and honest support during the production of this dissertation and my entire graduate experience. Thanks and respect also to committee members Dr. Marianne Henn, Dr. Garrett P. J. Epp, Dr. Uri Margolin, and Dr. Christine McWebb, to the examination chair Dr. Lynn Penrod, and especially to the external examiner Dr. Lynne Tatlock.

I would like to extend my gratitude to Jenni Feldman at the Rutherford Humanities and Social Sciences Library, Mary Stebner and Charlotte Holtz at Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery, and their respective colleagues, for this research and my academic experience at the University of Alberta have been greatly enriched by their friendly manner and professional service. Thanks very much also to the administrative staff in the Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies.

I am also grateful to Dr. Glenn Burger, Dr. Eugene Egert, Dr. Manfred Prokop, and Dr. Elena Siemens for the important roles they have played in my graduate training and professional development. For their help, encouragement, and friendship, I wish to thank Jackie Doig, Rick Lee, Dr. Michael MacKinnon, Peni Christopher, Kerstin Haßlöcher, Dr. Andrew Brown, Dr. Monique Tschofen, Dr. Chris Gibbins, Tara Wilson, L. Adien Dubbelboer, Dr. Caroline Rieger, Diana Spokiene, Ute Blunck, Angeles Espinaco-Virseda, Rose Merke, and Rick Dagg. For their love, kindness, and patience, I thank Nick Zwaagstra and my parents David and Gillian Plews.

I also acknowledge the assistance of the Izaak Walton Killam Trust.

Finally, I would like to express extra special thanks to Jan Chalk for, among many things, seeing me through to the end.

Edmonton, June 2001.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Preliminary Statement 1

Part One: An Archaeology of Modern Physiognomy 3

Part Two: A Genealogy of the Identity of Artist-Intellectuals 27

Part Three: The Specter of the Face 41

CHAPTER ONE
"Aus dem Gesicht verloren": The Physiognomical Shade and Chamisso's *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte* 59

CHAPTER TWO
Physiognomy, Artist-Figures, and Homosocial Desire in Mörike's *Maler Nolten* 95

CHAPTER THREE
Physiognomical Sensation and Cultural Coming of Age in Stifter's *Der Nachsommer* 165

CHAPTER FOUR
The Culture of Faces: Reading Physiognomical Relations in Thomas Mann's *Der Tod in Venedig* 205

CONCLUSION 250

BIBLIOGRAPHY 256

Introduction

Preliminary Statement

In this dissertation I set out to discuss the construction of the face in the novel in the modern age. In addition to Johann Caspar Lavater's physiognomic treatises, I shall gather evidence from literary portraits and physiognomical descriptions in seminal German-language Bildungs- and Künstlerromanen from the late eighteenth century through the early twentieth century. Novels by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Ludwig Tieck, Ernst Theodor Amadeus Hoffmann, Adelbert von Chamisso, Eduard Mörike, Adalbert Stifter, and Thomas Mann have, in regard to the face, perhaps less to do with a reaction against the systems of Enlightenment knowledge than they are governed by the underlying episteme of empirical science and the theory of signification of their own epoch. From this perspective, I shall reveal the various ways the new products of modern German-language literature and culture since the late eighteenth century have appropriated the face as a mode of representation in order either to contribute to and support or to query and critique its signification, the grounds of its representation.

I shall begin with a preliminary delineation of the practices that constituted the historical conditions of possibility for the development of the face as an object of knowledge. I shall first briefly outline the role played by the face in the Renaissance and classical analyses of human nature, before tracing the emergence of modern physiognomy as a system of thought that can be understood as the science of the face. Thus in the first section of the introductory first chapter of my work, I propose to undertake an *archaeology of modern physiognomy*.

Following this I shall conduct an investigation of the power-knowledge relations informing specifically Lavater's work on physiognomy. Here I shall argue that physiognomy does not decode an individual's character or nature, but is a complex system of classification, surveillance, and control that encodes the face to limit the freedom of some, while adorning others with privilege and success. Physiognomy is a theory of ordering human faces based on an order of human affairs, human destinies, and human identities. This pseudoscience is thus a political technology possessing its own specificity for expressing power. I demonstrate that an epistemology of physiognomy – essentially, divinitive power – is a record of social destiny or identity – an order that accords a popular astrology of the face – where that identity is a correlative of a certain technology of power over the face. This technology may be mobilized in favor of a certain hegemony.

I reveal that the hegemony dominating physiognomy consists of artists, writers, intellectuals, and physiognomists themselves. Many tend to regard physiognomists primarily as empirical scientists. However, if one considers them as cultural producers, then the orders, charts, and series they create, and in which they almost never directly appear, must be regarded as sites in which what is at stake is their bid for the power to assert their definition of the social destinies and identities both of certain faces and of cultural producers. Thus in the second section of the first chapter of my work, I propose to undertake a *genealogy of the identity of artists*.

After thus demonstrating both the conditions of the emergence of the face as an object of knowledge and the implications of power embedded in such a knowledge-formation, I shall conduct an analysis proper of the episteme which sustains the social function of identity performed by the face. Here I shall refer to such novels as Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* (*The Sorrows of Young Werther*, 1774), Ludwig Tieck's *Franz Sternbalds Wanderungen* (*Franz Sternbald's Journeys*, 1798), E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Lebens-Ansichten des Katers Murr* (*The Life and Opinions of Kater Murr / The Educated Cat*, 1820/22), and Eduard Mörike's *Maler Nolten* (*Nolten the Painter*, 1832) and their often critical attempts to locate or historicize the poet or artist-figure by means of the face. Thus in the third section of the first chapter of my work, I propose to undertake a brief discussion of the *specter of the face*.

Part One: An Archaeology of Modern Physiognomy

Physiognomy, the determination of human character or nature from the features or form of the face, is an ancient discipline that drew much renewed attention in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries from such intellectual figures as Claude de la Bellière, Marin Cureau de la Chambre, Charles Le Brun, Johann Jakob Scheuchzer, Jacques Pernetti, Julien Offray de la Mettrie, Antoine Joseph Pernety, Christian Peuschel, and Johann Caspar Lavater. This attention, however, was accompanied by a significant change both in the structures of thought that gave rise to physiognomy and in the sociocultural or political function of this pseudoscience. Once a system of metaphors and resemblances regulating and propounding the sincerity of a particular individual's virtue, physiognomy became a taxonomical system for decoding all character traits, that is, for firmly establishing the respective mind, aptitude, rank, and profession of all members of humanity.

At first, the special interest of Scheuchzer, Pernety, and Lavater, etc., may be regarded as part of the sustained cultural responses to political reconfiguration under absolutism and the development of a civil society based on the noble court (Courtine/Haroche 50). They are also largely in keeping with the Graecomania of the eighteenth century,[1] as well as with religious fatalism and the spirit of the enlightened rationality of the autonomous subject. These Enlightenment scholars were not entirely unlike the ancient Greek and Roman rhetoricians, and especially Polemo the Sophist from Asia Minor, who typically used physiognomical theories to destroy particular political and intellectual rivals. By means of derision – in the form of allusions to the lower cultural status of women, foreigners, and animals – Polemo was able to deprive his opponents' respective characters of moral fiber and mobilize social opinion in his own favor, thus frustrating their chances of success while furthering his own position and political destiny (see Barton; Gleason). On the surface, it appears that the latter-day group reverted to this morphological practice for the sake of determining a moral order between certain individuals. It appears they were concerned with reading the external features peculiar to the faces of certain individuals as signs by which one could ascertain genuine virtue in some, while exposing others as guilty of falsifying their vice with the deceit of seemingly good manners and appearances (see Stafford).

---

[1] In fact the earliest physiognomical works can be traced back to Mesopotamia (see Bottéro). The most famous physiognomical treatise from antiquity, *Physiognomonics*, was, in Lavater's day, still accredited to Aristotle. However, this text is pseudo-Aristotelian (see esp. André; Degkwitz). Other important authors and commentators on physiognomy in antiquity include (among others) Adamantius, Galen, Hippocrates, Loxus, Plato, Plotinus, Polemo, Pythagoras. For Greek and Latin authors on physiognomy, see André; Barton; Courtine/Haroche (79-80 n8); Gleason; Rivers (*Face Value* 18-23); Tytler (36-37). For Arab authors on physiognomy, see Courtine/Haroche (48-49).

However, it is not to Enlightenment rationality nor to the Ancients that we must look in order to comprehend the nature, appearance, and popularity of physiognomy immediately preceding, during, and, for that matter, long since the time of Johann Caspar Lavater. Rather, to understand the emergence of the face as an object of empirical knowledge in regard to the human condition peculiarly in the eighteenth century, but also thereafter, it is necessary to situate this phenomenon within the contemporaneous *episteme*, or total set of relations of discursive practices or structure of thought at that period, in which knowledge bases its positivity and so makes evident the conditions of its possibility (see Foucault, *Order* xxii). Such an archaeological approach to the experience of the knowledge of the face reveals much in common with French historian and philosopher Michel Foucault's discovery in *The Order of Things* that, generally, the system of thought of any era is akin to its "experience of order" (xxi), and that, specifically, the period known as the classical age is marked off between two epistemic shifts or discontinuities. The first, signaling the transition from the Renaissance structure of thought to that of the classical age, takes place about halfway through the seventeenth century. The second, occurring toward the end of the eighteenth century, brings the classical episteme to a close as it is superseded by the discursive regularities of the modern age. By such an approach, we avoid entertaining the idea of a progression in the structure of thought over these three periods, and instead observe transformations or discontinuations between them. An archaeology of discursive practices will show the structure of classical thought on physiognomical matters to be an analysis of human nature that in essence sets itself apart both from Renaissance knowledge of the face as well as from modern physiognomy in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century. In *Histoire du visage*, Jean-Jacques Courtine and Claudine Haroche become the first to apply Foucault's archaeological approach to the study of physiognomy. They consider the works of B. Coclès (Bartolommeo della Rocca) (see 41-42, 78n1-2) to mark the birth of a fascination with physiognomy that starts at the beginning of the sixteenth century and continues through to the end of the first two thirds of the seventeenth century (thus embracing Renaissance and classical epistemes), followed by a second phase of interest that culminates around 1780 and a clearly distinguishable third after 1850 (49). Lavater's physiognomical treatises, in regard both to their date of publication – *Von der Physiognomik* (*On Physiognomy*) in 1772 and *Physiognomische Fragmente* (*Physiognomical Fragments*) from 1775 to 1778 – and to the nature of the rules of formation of the knowledge they disseminate, appear to stand on the very frontier between the classical and modern ages.

According to Foucault, the structure of thought in the Renaissance is consistent with an order of things based on the forms of their resemblances. He cites convenience (adjacency or spatial proximity), emulation (an adjacency over distance), analogy (subtle resemblance), and sympathy (assimilation) as the four connotative forms. For instance, the form of resemblance called emulation exemplifies itself in the Renaissance knowledge that "The human face, from afar, emulates the sky, and just as man's intellect is an imperfect reflection of God's wisdom, so his two eyes, with their limited brightness, are a reflection of the vast illumination spread across the sky by sun and moon" (19). Foucault then explains that it is by way of signs that the knowledge of the resemblances between things comes to be expressed: "buried similitudes must be indicated on the surface of things; there must be visible marks for the invisible analogies" (26). But since the Renaissance world is comprehensible by means of likenesses, these signs are themselves produced by their resemblance to what they signify. Thus, one resemblance is served by another, and that in turn is known by yet another – Foucault designates the observable marks of resemblance as "signatures" or "conjuncture" – and the structure of the world and of the knowledge of the world are inherent in each other. Language, then, since it is a system of signs, is at once also a system of resemblances, the marks of writing, and a part of the world. This fact of the unity of language and the world facilitates the answer to the question "how it was possible to know that a sign did in fact designate what it signified" (42). Consequently – for different written texts form related commentaries – the Renaissance episteme about any one topic includes, on an even footing with one another, and in no particular order, all kinds of forms of knowledge, whether fantastic, learned, or observed, in order to string together an endless chain of similar and associative information on that topic.

Giovanni Battista (Giambattista) della Porta's *De humana physiognomonia* (1586) is undoubtedly the most well-known example of physiognomical scholarship from the Renaissance.[2] Twenty editions appeared in the seventy years following publication (Thorndike VIII: 449). Here, a range of men's faces per se form resemblances with the heads of animals in order to accommodate the notion of similarities in their character. Porta also interprets every part of the body, and includes numerous references to many of his better-known ancient and medieval predecessors as well as stories from antiquity. Physiognomy in the narrowest sense of the word, the divination of human character by the features of the face, is thus only one of several forms of like knowledge Porta uses to reveal human character. The Renaissance principle of an order of endlessly concatenate resemblances, which governs the structure of thought in which knowledge (of nature, of language, etc.) manifests the conditions of its possibility, is thus also evident in respect to the face as an object of knowledge in the interpretation of human character. Even a work as late as *L'Art de connoistre les hommes* (1669) by Marin Cureau de la Chambre – a writer known especially for being influenced by Descartes (Rivers, *Face Value* 29-31; Stafford 85; Tytler 44) – also insists that the body, the "inclinations, passions, and habits" of a man's soul, and the stars are signs of one another (Cureau 237-43).

Should the episteme of physiognomical practices in the classical age cohere with the common structure of the examples of knowledge at this time – such as natural history, general grammar, and the analysis of wealth – that Foucault studies in *The Order of Things*, then the system of thought in which the knowledge of human nature and the virtuous face manifests its conditions of possibility will no longer pertain to the interpretation of endlessly concatenate resemblances in which there is a nondistinction between words and things. Rather, classical physiognomies will be grounded in a method of analysis of representations and signs in the form of scientifically ordered tables. We will expect to witness less the interpretation of character and more the tabulation or analysis of human nature.

---

[2] For further discussion of Renaissance physiognomy, see Courtine/Haroche (41-88; for examples of "resemblances," "signatures," "analogies," and "marks," see particularly 57-58, 61, 70, 88).

Foucault points out that in the classical age resemblances were no longer viewed as sufficiently accurate for formulating the order of reality. It was realized that there were no limits to resemblances. Foucault specifies Descartes as the inaugural figure of the classical perspective that complements a consideration of resemblance as erroneous and deceptive with the demand for a positive body of knowledge (see also Courtine/Haroche 89-91, 103; cf. Rivers, *Face Value* 25, 29). Likewise, just as there is a dissolution of the resemblances between things, so there is a breakdown in the semantic unity between words and things, implying that form and content must unravel. Language, then, is no longer at one with the world, but rather remains nothing other than "what is said" (43). It no longer supplies knowledge, or guarantees the sign's ability to signify, by being the marks of resemblance of the world. Instead, language is "an art of naming" that rearranges things as words.[3]

One consequence of the decline of the resemblances between things and the semantic unity between words and things – a consequence that may serve as an explanation for the epistemic shift and emergence of different discourses in the eighteenth century – was a gradual awareness of the binary system of signs and, particularly, the separation of the sign from what it signifies (see also Geitner 360). At this time signs are, on the one hand, the means of analysis (just as they were once, though differently, the means of interpretation and comprehension) since "the ordering of things by means of signs constitutes all empirical forms of knowledge as knowledge based upon identity and difference" (Foucault, *Order* 57). They are the "tools of analysis, marks of identity and difference, principles whereby things can be reduced to order, keys for a taxonomy" (58). Yet on the other hand, they are the product of analysis. There is an inversion of the relation that once held knowledge as the passive effect of the opening of signs (*divinatio*) to a new relation that now has knowledge actively effect signs: "The sign does not wait in silence for the coming of a man capable of recognizing it: it can be constituted only by an act of knowing ... From now on ... it is within knowledge itself that the sign is to perform its signifying function; it is from knowledge that it will borrow its certainty or its probability" (59). Signs, the observable features of things, are caught in a loop since, in the classical age, they are the resource or components of analysis of knowledge and are also the measurements and order produced by knowledge in the endeavor to show an arbitrary system that confirms the conditions of the configuration of that which is observed, the object of knowledge.

---

[3] For a discussion of the distrust of man-made language as it relates to Lavater, see Geitner (366-69); and Rivers (*Face Value* 80-82).

Likewise, language does not provide knowledge of the world, rather empirical knowledge constructs language or discourse: a system of representations or signs, the sum of its own features, and the means by which it may be analyzed, measured, and ordered, so that it may confirm itself. In the Renaissance, signs were natural resemblances and so, by way of the mark of resemblance, almost the same thing as that which they signified, thus enabling comprehension. In the classical age, however, signs and language are no longer part of the world and there is no inherent connection between the sign and the signified. Instead, it is the order of knowledge, supported by the features of the sign, that certifies the sign.

As Foucault claims: "The relation of the sign to the signified now resides in a space in which there is no longer any intermediary figure to connect them" (63). Rather, the sign exists in the mind as a perception. The classical sign is no longer the conjuncture or similitude, but an arbitrary, yet direct representation, image, or idea of the world or that which it signifies: "what connects them is a bond established, inside knowledge, between the *idea of one thing* and the *idea of another*" (63). This new mental space of the sign implies that the classical sign will have different relations to what it signifies than its Renaissance counterpart, which still resided in the world it signified. The signifying element (previously, a conjunctural resemblance) is not, by itself, sufficient to be a sign. As if to compensate for the lack of an intermediary with the world, the classical sign must perform the duality of containing within itself the thing representing and the thing represented. It must not only signify that which it signifies by representing it, it must also signal its representationality, its power to represent, or that it has a representative function: "It can become a sign only on condition that it manifests ... the relation that links it to what it signifies. It must represent; but that representation, in turn, must also be represented within it" (64). Thus the classical sign signifies its object by being transparent with it, by requiring its content and not simply by being any mere likeness. That which is represented – the content of the object signified by the sign – may now only be visible by the fact of being represented, and so the sign reveals its connection to the signified. The sign in the classical age is, therefore, according to Foucault, "a duplicated representation," it is "doubled over on itself" (65). This feature of the classical sign may be demonstrated by sketched profiles and paintings of countenances (and their use in physiognomies), since a portrait, like the map in the example Foucault provides from the *Logique de Port-Royal*, "has no other content in fact than that which it represents, and yet that content is made visible only because it is represented by a representation" (64). The beautiful portrait signifies its object, it indicates a certain nature, by being 'transparent' with it, by requiring the content of virtue – its goodness, its handsomeness, in the shape, surface, and expression of the face – as its sole determinant, and not by any natural resemblances to other people, animals, or stars. Yet this content is distinguishable only by dint of being clearly observable, or represented, in the representation of a beautiful countenance. Under the rubric of the eighteenth-century episteme, handsome is *not* as handsome does, but as handsome *appears* in all its detail.

So it is that Foucault shows how the transparency and representationality of the classical sign replace intermediary resemblance in order to act as a guarantee that the sign indeed signifies what it appears to. Yet, at the same time, he indicates that it is precisely because of the absence of a conjuncture that a space opens for an analysis of representation (or discursive examination of things) to explain the direct relation between the sign and the signified (see Gutting 151). Since signs reside in the mind as representations of that which is observed, an analysis of those perceptions in description – which is transparent with the imaginings it represents – will suffice for the provision of their content.[4] Likewise, a description or depiction of the beautiful countenance is sufficient to reveal its fine and handsome content. However, in order to know the meaning of the content of that sign, the sign must be arranged with all other signs. To know the virtuous meaning of the beautiful countenance, there needs to be a whole array of heads and faces: "meaning cannot be anything more than the totality of the signs arranged in their progression; it will be given in the complete *table* of signs" (66). Thus, in the classical age, resemblance does not provide meaning, but it does initiate comparisons between direct representations that in their arrangement, their ordering in imagination, substantiate the comprehension of things.

In the classical age that follows Descartes, the "structure" of the visible surface or external constituents of things is compared, measured, and ordered, thus becoming the resource for its own exhaustive analysis. The observable "lines, surfaces, forms, reliefs" (133) that Foucault identifies in his example of natural history will be the same elements that reappear in classical physiognomy. These elements are deciphered by being given names or nominal descriptions (Foucault asserts, in the case of natural history, by the grid of the four variable aspects of form, quantity, relative distribution, and relative magnitude, 134). This process enables the visible reproduction of the object in words. But these words are as yet only nouns. Their content is known, but they require a more elaborate description and comparison with like signs for their meaning to come to light. Consequently, things are arranged consecutively, with other things in a certain field, in tables of knowledge that classify them to their proper place according to one of two possible processes – systemic (selection) or methodic (deduction or subtraction) – that differentiates them or identifies them with certain classes by reference to particular essences, elements, or features. These features form the "character" of a thing and are not observed distinctions or commonalities, but elements already made available in the naming of structure. The table of representations is thus ordered in the enumerative and measured terms of both quantitative (*mathetic*) and qualitative (*taxonomic*) relations of difference and identity, that is, simply and respectively, the frequency and presence of certain characteristics. As a result, the table and its representations are much less a part of the world than they are a duplication of the apparent order and structure of things in it. Likewise, knowledge in the classical age is not a matter of recognition or interpretation as it was during the Renaissance, but more a question of comparative analysis or descriptive discrimination. Knowledge uses comparisons between signs in the mind to establish relations of difference that appear in common description; it fabricates language on the basis of a nominal order of things in order to transcribe its perception of the world. This way the world comes to refer to itself in a tabulation of representations that, individually, are known by their consecutive deferral of one another.

---

[4] For remarks on how description, or metaphorical language, fills the gap between mind, image, and the real thing observed, see Geitner (371); Niehaus (425); Pestalozzi (143-45); Rivers (*Face Value* 90-91); Stafford (56); cf. Shortland (302-03).

Foucault thus explains that in the classical structure of thought the visible comes to refer to itself: in botany the visible external structure of the plant is that resource that literally expresses itself in the name of the plant; in the study of wealth, wealth finds expression in an alienated version of itself, that is, money and exchange. Likewise, as far as the physiognomical practices that form the object of this study are concerned, the very same structure of thought is operative in constituting the analysis of human nature. In the classical age, human nature is expressed by referring to itself, since the visible external structure of human nature is that resource that enables its expression in its very alienation, or representative equivalence, that is, in the instance of virtue (or vice), and in very basic terms, beauty (or lack of beauty).[5]

In the classical age, physiognomy, or the analysis of human nature, thus gradually loses its dependence on signatures or resemblances between a human face and the outlook of the heavens, the position of the stars, or the heads of animals, etc., as well as on erudite documents and fables. Instead, it relies for the conditions of its possibility on a science of order based on the quantitative or qualitative observation of surfaces and lines located directly on the body (see also Courtine/Haroche esp. 89-99[/-116, 121]; Geitner esp. 370; Rivers, *Face Value* 29). In his *Physiognomical Fragments*, published a century after Descartes, Lavater offers, along similar lines to the French philosopher's general disapproval of Renaissance methods of knowledge, a brief criticism of Porta's – as well as Aristotle's – unsatisfactory use of resemblances for the divination of human character. Lavater says: "Aristotle and, after him, particularly Porta are known to have based a lot on these resemblances – but often quite poorly since they saw resemblances where there weren't any and overlooked those which were conspicuous."[6] It appears that the indiscriminate manner in which the texts preceding Lavater link the things of the world and furnish commentary with commentary is the very reason why he abandons those texts in favor of starting with the clean slate of nature and portraits as his resource material: "I often wanted to look through all the authors who have written on physiognomy, and started to read here and there, but could hardly bear all the stuff and nonsense with which the majority of them were rewriting Aristotle. I then immediately threw them all away again and, as I had done before, stuck with mere nature and portraits."[7] Physiognomy, as it is formulated in the classical age, thus does not intend retelling human nature by compiling each and every picture or document that bears the marks of its presence, but rather it is a science of signs that appears in the gap between the thing observed and what is said about it, and that authorizes both the naming or transcription of the visibility or perception of human nature in the elements of a human face, as well as its arrangement in the context of other faces.

---

[5] The case of virtue that is signified by beauty – a transcription of itself – corresponds with the second of three variables that determine the sign in classical thought. A sign may be defined by the variable of "the type of relation: [it] may belong to the whole that it denotes (in the sense that a healthy appearance is part of the health it denotes)" (58). The other two variables are "the certainty of the relation" and "the origin of the relation."

The structure of the visible surface of one face is examined consecutively and comparatively with others' by one, several, or all of a set of variables, their lines and surfaces, shape or outline and proportion of features, number and distribution of distinguishing marks or blemishes, as well as expressions (their pathognomy), and, subsequently, ordered by being given concordant names. The study of the quarrelsome hearts of Cain and Abel in Table XXXIII of the *Physica Sacra* (1731), the natural history of the things that appear in the holy scriptures, written by the Swiss Johann Jakob Scheuchzer, serves as a concise (and in his work, isolated) example of the classical structure of thought informing a physiognomical analysis of human nature.[8] Here, six faces appear on the frame of an illustration depicting the two brothers both slaughtering a lamb as a sacrifice to god. They are numbered from one to six, are identifiable as three Abel-heads and three Cain-heads, yet each one is sufficiently different in expression from the next, and, finally, they are each given a name: "1. sadness, 2. devotion or piety, 3. joy, 4. despair, 5. hate, anger, 6. envy" (47). Their content is known simply by display and nomination, but their meaning is explained only by their numerical arrangement and description. Cain's anger at the more favorable consideration his brother's sacrifice receives from god, and thus the sign of his lack of piety or virtue, is discussed in a physiognomic and pathognomic manner:

---

[6] "*Aristoteles*, und nach ihm am meisten *Porta*, haben bekanntermaßen viel auf diese Aehnlichkeit gefußet – aber oft sehr schlecht; denn sie sahen Aehnlichkeiten, wo keine – und diejenigen oft nicht, die auffallend waren" (287). For the sake of accessibility I refer in the main to the Reclam edition of Lavater's *Fragments*. In some instances where a section does not appear in the Reclam edition, I refer to the original. Translations are, where possible, from Holcroft's version, otherwise they are my own.

[7] "Ich wollt' oft alle Schriftsteller von der Physiognomie durchgehen, fieng an hier und dort zu lesen, konnte aber das Gewäsche der meisten, die alle den *Aristoteles* ausschrieben, kaum ausstehen. Dann schmiß ich sie sogleich wieder weg – und hielt mich, wie zuvor an die bloße Natur und an Bilder" (20).

> The equilibrium between the blood and the humors is consumed, the sensual spirits roar like an impetuous forest stream or a brook after torrential rain from the brain to the heart, the noblest instrument of the body, which then contracts with more strength than usual and squirts blood into the smallest of tiny veins with the most extreme violence. This causes the face to blush, the eyes to flash, the mouth to foam, the chaps to tremble, and all the other bodily parts to begin to move in such disarray as if they had wanted to equip themselves for a serious battle. Whoever wants to see for themselves a rough idea of this very intense passion, should like to read the Senecam de Ira.
>
> However, the situation with these emotions is thus that they vary, and that one chases the other from the nest. Pious Abel is of a quiet disposition and a merry face. But Cain, who foams with anger, changes his form at each moment; one moment he

---

[8] Other often cited exemplary instances of the Cartesian / classical structure of thought in physiognomical practice include Le Brun (see Courtine/Haroche 89-100, 102-03, 106-08, 136; Rivers, *Face Value* 26-29; Schmölders 247; Tytler 44) and Cureau (see Courtine/Haroche 98-101; Rivers, *Face Value* 29-31; Stafford 85; Tytler 44).

reddens with fury, the next he pales with envy, which may be called quite reasonably a rage, and a long-lasting one at that, an inebriation of the souls. Henceforth, the seething blood unfortunately inundates the body, since the emotions of such a heart overrun its banks; the nerves play master, the skin retracts, the little stream of blood runs a little more slowly through the furthest tiny veins; the heart is encumbered and under troubled sighs can hardly pump the blood; the poor man is gnawed at and consumed by envy day and night, his sleep is disturbed, his appetite ruined, his body wanes, his face grows pallid: Simmering waves, flashing flames, / crash together, / Order and course gradually stop, / Heart-strain, trembling, flesh / fading away, / Discoloring, / wasting, / are brought about by Cain's devilish sins.

His face becomes a slave to him; or: his gestures hide his true feelings.[9] The thirty-third plate of the *Physica Sacra* demonstrates how vice or rage rushes inside the body and rises to the surface to cause a reddening of the face, but gradually ravages its host and inevitably makes its appearance as pallor, the permanent mark on the human face designating a lack of piety, a sign, an external representation or structure, then, that refers to itself, that is, elements of itself, and, since this face is compared with five others on the frame of the illustration, it is a part of a taxonomic system of the representation of human nature.

---

[9] "[D]as Gleich-Gewicht zwischen dem Geblüthe und Nerven-Safft, wird aufgehaben, die Sinnlichen Geister rauschen gleich einem ungestümmen Wald-Wasser und reissenden Regen-Bach, aus dem Gehirnlein in das Hertze, welches vornehmste Werkzeuge des Leibes, sich so dann ungewöhnlich stärker zusammen ziehet, und mit äusserster Gewalt das Blut in die kleinste Aederlein ausssprützet; worauf das Gesichte erröthet, die Augen funckeln, der Mund schaumet, die Leffzen zittern, alle andere Leibes-Glieder in unordentliche Bewegung gerathen, als wenn sie sich zu einem ernsthafften Kampff rüsten wolten; Wer einen fernern lebhafften Entwurff von dieser so hefftigen Leidenschaft sich machen will, beliebe den Senecam de Ira nachzulesen.

Es ist aber mit denen Gemüths-Bewegungen also bewandt, daß sie abwechseln, und je eine die ander aus dem Nest jaget. Der fromme Abel ist eines ruhigen Gemüths, freudigen Angesichts: Aber der Zorn-schaumende Cain ändert augenblicklich seine Gestalt; bald erröthet er im Grimm, bald erblaßt er im Neid, welchen man nicht unbillich eine- und zwar lange daurende Raserei nennen mag, eine Trunckenheit der Seelen. Das wallende Geblüt hat leider nunmehro den Leib überschwemmet, da die Bewegungen des Hertzens solches über seine Ufer treiben; die Nerven spielen den Meister, die Haut zieht sich ein, das Blut-Bächlein rinnet etwas langsamer durch die äusserste Aederlein; das Hertz wird beschweret, und kan unter bedrangten Seuffzern das Geblüte kaum forttreiben; Tags so Nachts wird der arme Mensch von Neid angefressen und verzehret, der Schlaff unterbrochen, Lust zum essen verderbet, der Leib nimt ab, das Angesicht verbleichet: Siedende Wellen, blitzende Flammen, / Schlagen zusammen, / Ordnung und Lauff allmählich hört auf, / Hertz-drücken, erzittern, am Fleische ab- / schwinden, / Entfärben, verderben, / Bewürcken des Cains verteufelte Sünden.

Das Angesicht verfiel ihm; Oder: Sein Gebährde verstellet sich" (46).

Scheuchzer's brief physiognomical deliberations thus reflect a certain structure of thought – they are a qualitative discrimination – that limits and controls the possibility of that thought and ultimately what can be said and known.

Lavater's work follows the same basic pattern except on a much grander scale. The faces of human nature, bearing the names of individuals and/or types, appear in simultaneous tables of knowledge, with each 'species' of face being examined in a contradistinctive arrangement of examples accompanied by a relevant description and classified according to differences established among their external features. Lavater usually differentiates between faces by the systemic technique of the a priori selection of elements. His classical physiognomy is, again, a qualitative discrimination (see also Geitner 370). Indeed, in Lavater's work the knowledge of the nature of a poet, of a woman, or of a Pole, for example, is experienced within a set order in which various faces are arranged and differentiated by colluding with variations in certain features of the face.

Though Lavater denies having lent any overall order to his *Fragments* (see 10), it is probably not insignificant that artists, painters, sculptors, and musicians are discussed before attaining the genial heights of poets. The greater poet is known by manifesting neither a too "straight" nor too "rounded" a forehead, by having neither eyes that are too "deep-set," nor "eyebrows that are close to the eyes," nor an upper lip that is convex, nor lips that are "acutely determined," nor skin that is "brown, leathery, dry, inflexible, evenly taut," nor a skull that is "flat on top," nor a head that is "perpendicular" at the back (228-29). By way of exemplary demonstration of the absence of such features so incompatible with the nature of a poet, Lavater describes an image of Johann Timotheus Hermes. This is briefly compared with a portrait of Johann Georg Zimmermann whose eyes apparently reveal not a poet but someone with a sense for and appreciation of poetry (233), and is then followed by five attempts at capturing the physical genius of Goethe (which are also accompanied by a comparison, this time, with Goethe's clever but unpoetic father).[10]

Lavater transcribes and orders differences among the visible elements of the face so as to classify the structure of the nature of women. In addition, however, women and men are to have contrasting physiognomies. Hence the extent to which a particular woman may be considered as containing within her the most womanly of natures is exactly proportionate to the extent to which the elements of her face differ from those usually exhibited by, or more appropriate to, a man. Supposedly, women are "softer," "slimmer," they "tread quietly," they "glance and feel," they are "light," "smaller and frailer," "smoother and gentler," "whiter," "more naive," their hair is "softer and longer," their eyebrows "thinner," the lines on their faces are "bent inwards more," they are "more curvaceous," they are more often perpendicular in profile, and, finally, they are "rounder" (267, 269). This system is then demonstrated with two descriptions that contrast the "extraordinary," "repulsive," and "for certain no usual feminine soul" captured in the transition from the forehead to the nose (269) in the image of Anna Amalie, the daughter of Friedrich Wilhelm I and abbess of Quedlinburg, with the "much more simplicity, practical unequivocalness (Einsinnigkeit)" and so apparently more feminine (271) daughter of Johann Georg Zimmermann. Similar such affirmations are established further in two series of seven and then three silhouettes of women.

---

[10] For a discussion of the physiognomy of genius in Goethe and in Lavater, see Wellbery (334ff., esp. 355-56). See also Tytler 11.

Likewise, the nature of a Pole is supposedly recognizable by the features exhibited in the example given of the brief description and image of a Polish nobleman arranged in a table of national physiognomies for the sake of comparison with the description and images of a Russian, a German, two Turks, and an Englishman. This plate is subsequently followed by another displaying a Spaniard, a Dutchman, a Moor, and an Amerindian from Virginia, with an additional image of a Kalmyk Mongolian (320-25).

Although Lavater's physiognomical treatises of human nature seem to be archetypal in regard to the taxonomical structure of thought in the classical age, they do exhibit a particular characteristic that is at once in keeping with and somewhat differing from the findings of Foucault's discussion of the natural histories by Antoine-Laurent de Jussieu, Félix Vicq d'Azyr, Jean Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet de Lamarck, and Augustin-Pyrame Candolle. The French epistemologist deems these works likewise typical of classical thought structures yet decisive in setting the fundamental conditions of the possibility of biology and the modern episteme. That innovative and significant characteristic in the positive scheme of knowing things engineered by such pivotal scientific writers toward the end of the eighteenth century is the modification and subordination of the (superficial) external elements by the (inner) "organic structure" of living beings as the point of reference in their analysis. Indeed, Foucault's archaeology reveals that at the end of the eighteenth century "the general area of knowledge is ... an area made up of organic structures, that is, of internal relations between elements whose totality performs a function" (218). Indeed, Foucault goes on to show that the external features or elements that enable designation and derivation of a species in the natural historical analysis of living things are modified, at this time, by the excision and dissection of the organs of the body, and subordinated to the life-function of those organs as that which assists the tabulation of living things.

But, of course, in Lavater's case, and in the case of those physiognomists of the modern era who follow him (including craniologists and phrenologists, physiologists, psychologists and psychiatrists, and, particularly, geneticists), the analysis of human nature by the set of its elements does not turn inward in search of organic units in the sense of vital internal systems (see also Fischer/Stumpp 124; Pestalozzi 142). Instead of acquiring vital structures as those elements from which one derives the difference and sameness that enable the designation of an order of knowledge, Lavater's cuspal classical analysis of human nature perceives and insists on using the organic accessory of bone structure as a natural language and so persists with the superficial structure of the face and head as its sign and key. But Lavater's preference for the always given organic surface of immovable bone structure over expressive features marks the beginning of the end of human representation as a language unified with a sign dependent on the human body (cf. Courtine/Haroche 136). Courtine and Haroche reveal the history of the face to be that of the emergence of expression, that is, the history of the control of expression. Man of civil society is man without passion, spontaneity, or expression, whose measured behavior is constructed by normative religious, political, social, and ethical discourses as man of passion is effaced and silenced (see esp. 19-20). To a certain extent, with Lavater *the face persists, and yet emerges for the first time*. It will no longer appear simply as the feature of beauty or pallor, serenity or ugliness, just as there will eventually be no great need to measure the form, quantity, distribution, and proportion of individual elements of the face in order to establish human nature. Rather, the face begins to acquire the new aspect of abstract social relations. The structure of human nature is no longer informed simply by the measurements or expressions of external elements, but rather those features soon become predicated by dimensions and qualities attributed to a certain role or a particular rank in society. In Lavater's scheme, *the order of human nature is ultimately the effect of faces attached to identity*.

Those 'observable' elements, which, by their differences, enable the determination and tabulation of the nature of, for instance, poets, women, and various nationalities, are hardly the product of the measurement of natural structure and expression. Rather, they are more the result or physical emanation of an "organic identity" (Courtine/Haroche 128), that is, of what in Swiss and German society was the commonly perceived and generally accepted social function or contribution of certain people. Karl Pestalozzi draws attention to the paradox of Lavater's method, of how the physiognomist observes those already deemed insane or remarks upon those colleagues and personages whose professional success is already well-known in order a posteriori to gather marks that enable human character to be known a priori (146-47). Likewise, Richard Gray points out that, because Lavater draws his examples from the madhouse or from among famous cultural figures, the resulting physiognomies are "already preprogrammed" ("Sign and *Sein*" 310).[11] As the following review of the three examples I have taken from Lavater's *Fragments* will show, it is the social role or function – that is, identity of an individual or type – that supplies the elements that differentiate and tabulate human nature. It is the very function of being a poet, a woman, or a Pole that determines their nature as it appears in their faces.

The Polish nobleman – a certain Piedrojewski (369n) – is supposedly "recognizable as a *Polack* especially by the regression of his long forehead, by the protruding curve of the back of his head, which is covered with hair, and by the long rise of his neck."[12] With his disparaging description of this face, Lavater appears to have nothing positive to say about the nature of a Pole. Besides, the linguistic sign of the face is thus far representative as the sum of its contents, and is therefore comprehensible, but as yet lacks signification. Indeed, it is not singularly from the observation of the outward content or features of this face that one is to know the nature of the Pole. Rather, meaning is supplied by the modification of the elements of the face so that they naturally accord a social relation. It is only by such a modification that it will be possible to place the Pole in a taxonomical order and so know him. As mentioned above, it is identity or social function that subordinates, reinvests, and supplies the elements that, by their meaningful differences, enable the determination of human nature. Accordingly, the features of the Polishman's face are insubstantial unless they are concurrently read as the physical emanation of the function or identity of a Pole as far as Lavater's compatriots are concerned. In the case of the Pole, the face becomes merely a signifier on a secondary level to which the concept of a "cattle herdsman" is added as a modified signified.[13] It is in this way that the second-order semiological sign of *the "jovial" face of a Pole* is perceived and established. In fact, Lavater adds in a footnote that "the Pole is the jovial one among the uneducated nations, just as the Hungarian is the choleric one. All these nations are more or less cattle herdsmen, live in the open air, and are distanced from all intellectual culture and all the strife that comes with imaginary needs. Hence their excellent strength, agility, and speed, which in us turns into the dullness and aridity of one's spirits, which we cultivate more in the inner man, which do not have more ardent passions, but which for no moment of life are almost without these passions."[14] It is only by the

---

[11] Geitner also mentions how people's function is preexistent (378-80), often in literature (376-82). Gilman also remarks on given texts or intertexts upon which Lavater has drawn ("Lavater" 51, 53-54).

---

[12] "besonders durch das Zurückgehende seiner langen Stirne, durch den vorherstehenden Bogen seines mit Haaren bedeckten Hinterhauptes – durch den weit hinaufgehenden Hals – als *Polake* kennbar" (320).

[13] My own analysis here relies on Roland Barthes's semiological approach (see *Mythologies*). For a discussion of Lavater's semiotics, see Böhme (esp. 166-70); Gray ("Die Geburt;" "Sign and *Sein*" 306-07); Pestalozzi (esp. 140-42); Rivers (*Face Value* esp. 72, 79, 92); Shortland; Zelle.

[14] "Der *Pohle* ist unter den ungebildeten Nationen der Joviale, so wie der Ungar der Cholerische. Alle diese Nationen sind mehr oder weniger Viehhirten, leben in freyer Luft, und sind fern von aller Kultur des Geistes, und allem Kummer wegen eingebildeter Bedürfnisse. Daher ihre vorzügliche Stärke und Behendigkeit, und Schnelligkeit, die in Stumpfheit und Dürre der Lebensgeister bey uns übergeht, die wir den innern Menschen

'observation' of such a social function through the transparency of the face that the Pole may take his place in a taxonomical order that reveals the knowledge of his nature. Since the Pole is considered suited to be a "cattle herdsman," it is recognizable that he is "jovial" by nature.

The same oppressive system applies to the knowledge of the nature of women.[15] The elements that substantiate the linguistic sign of the face of a woman are those physical features modified by the concept, that is, function or role of a woman. It is this modification that will assist the location of women in discourse, that is, in the physiognomical taxonomy of human nature. Lavater proclaims that women "are the resonance of man ... taken from man to be subservient to man, to comfort him with the consolation of an angel, to lighten his cares."[16] This identity-function of women conceived as servant, companion, and consoler to men supplies the differentiating elements that subsequently support the structure of woman and determine her nature. The concept of servant and consoler thus enables the sign of *the "warm-hearted face" of a woman* ("der herzvolle Blick," 260). The fact that the face is transparent with this identity makes it possible to place woman in the very classification system that makes her nature known. Since a woman's role is supposedly to serve and comfort her husband, her face will testify that she is "noble," "educated," "soft," "restrained," "tender," and "inwardly strong and secure" (260-61) by nature.

Likewise, those elements or physical features modified by the concept of – that is, function performed by – a poet are given to sustaining the linguistic sign of the face of a poet. This modification then assists the location of poets in the physiognomical taxonomy of human nature. According to Lavater, "the poet is at once a painter and a musician, and more than both together"; he is someone "who could make the most unnoticed visibilities and the innermost invisibilities generally comprehensible"; he has the "possibility and provision of

---

mehr anbauen, nicht heftigere Leidenschaften haben, aber keinen Augenblick des Lebens beynahe ohne dieselben sind" (320n).

[15] On sexism in physiognomy, see esp. Rivers (*Face Value* 21, 23, 70-71); and S. Frey (87). Pestalozzi also remarks that Lavater's physiognomy is "predominantly concerned with male faces" (147).

[16] "Sie sind Nachlaut der Mannheit ... vom Manne genommen, dem Mann unterthan zu seyn, zu trösten ihn mit Engelstrost, zu leichtern seine Sorgen" (264).

receiving everything in an easy, pure, and complete manner, of returning everything in an easy, pure, and complete manner; with the addition in fact of his own genuine individuality ... and medium, that which otherwise would be imperceptible to and unfelt by each and every sense of everyone is made perceptible to and felt by them"; finally, he is "the prophet of divine creation and providence; the mediator between nature and the sons and daughters of nature."[17] This identity or function performed by the poet as prophet and go-between modifies the elements of the face of a poet.[18] It is in this way that the sign of *the "elasticity" of a poet's face* ("Elastizität," 227) is constructed. After all, the poet "must have the finest and most sensitive form," and that "this form must be not only pithy, relaxed, and impressionable for the purpose of receiving [impressions], but also elastic, resonant, and resilient for the purpose of giving [those impressions] back." Consequently, the poet's face "can and should comprise neither of only straight or hard-edged, nor of only soft, rounded-off, unresisting, and empathetic lines and contours."[19] And it is just such a transparency of the face with the social function of the poet that makes it possible to classify poets physiognomically and know that they exhibit "a mild propensity to be touched, even profoundly moved, and have a resonant elasticity" by nature.[20]

Thus human nature as it is known by the discourse of classical physiognomy at the end of the eighteenth century is only a legible physicality by dint of being primarily a set of preconceived notions or opinions. In other words, in the realm of the face as the object of the knowledge of human nature, that face is a transparency of prejudice.

---

[17] "Der *Dichter* ist *Mahler* und *Musiker* zugleich, und mehr als beyde zusammen" (225); "der die unbemerktesten Sichtbarkeiten, die innigsten Unsichtbarkeiten allgemein verstehbar machen konnte"; "Möglichkeit und Disposition, alles leicht und rein und ganz zu empfangen, leicht und rein und ganz zurückzugeben; mit einem *Zusatze* zwar von seiner *eigenen ächten Individualität* ... und *Medium* wird allen Sinnen aller Menschen das wahrnehmlich und fühlbar zu machen, was ihnen sonst unwahrnehmlich und unfühlbar wäre"; "Der *Dichter* ist *Prophet der Schöpfung und der Fürsehung Gottes. Mittler zwischen der Natur und den Söhnen und Töchtern der Natur*" (227).

[18] I do not wish to confuse the social function of the poet, that is, the poet's professional role in or contribution to society, with Foucault's "author function" by which one understands the phenomenon of the author not as a historical constant, but rather as the "function" of discourse that changes throughout social and cultural history. See Michel Foucault, "What is an Author?"

[19] "Daß er die feinste, sensibelste Bildung haben muß; Daß aber diese Bildung nicht nur markig, locker, rührbar zum Empfange; Daß sie auch elastisch, wiedertönend, zurückschnellend seyn muß, zum Geben; Daß sie also weder aus bloß geraden oder harteckigten Linien und Umrissen, noch aus bloß weichen, abgerundeten, unwiderstehenden, leidsamen bestehen kann und soll" (228).

[20] "Leichte Rührbarkeit, Erschütterlichkeit, wiederhallende Schnellkraft" (227).

For the sake of noting the further general epistemological consistency between Lavater's physiognomy in this study and the example of Jussieu's natural history in Foucault's discussion, it is important to point out that, like Jussieu in his analysis of living beings, Lavater does not question the configuration of knowledge of human nature according to the rule of taxonomy. Regardless of any change in the composition of the sign from intrinsic reciprocity to a reliance on the outside principle of abstract social relations, the Swiss physiognomist still intends to establish a set of elements from the total representation of the person so as to set about creating an order of knowledge. As shown above, these elements unite individuals and types into groups and then establish differences between those groups so as to order them in a table where they find their proper place. In Foucault's words, those distinguishing elements "are the analysis of that representation and make it possible, by representing those representations, to constitute an order" (226).

However, as the examples above demonstrate, just as Lavater is devising a comprehensive physiognomical taxonomy of all aspects of human nature, he is also laying the foundations of its seeming demise and irreversible transformation. While Christopher Rivers sees Lavater regressing to even before the Cartesian shift that "'modernizes' [*sic*] physiognomical thought" (*Face Value* 29; cf. 95), most other critics locate the Swiss physiognomist solidly within the classical episteme. Michael Shortland sees Lavater having given up analogies (cf. Rivers, *Face Value* 95), and Michael Niehaus positions the Swiss's work at a time clearly distinguishable in approach from the more "synthetic" system of the "social body" underlying the meaning of the nineteenth-century *physiologies* under review in his study (419). Carl Niekerk considers the physiognomy debate ("der Physiognomikstreit") between Lavater and, first, Goethe and, then, Georg Christoph Lichtenberg as marking the point of the shift or discontinuity between the classical and modern epistemes, that Lavater's endeavor to accumulate knowledge of the individual by the sensual perception of the body's exterior – that the two are one – is typical of his consistancy with eighteenth-century thought (5-6; see also Gray, "Sign and *Sein*" 302-04; Neumann, "Rede" 101). But I see the shift to a relation external to the sign as the basis of order already anticipated within Lavater's work. Lavater's organic surfaces are already informed by abstract functions, that is, his sense of another is informed less by direct measurements of the external body and more by existing social prejudice. While Lichtenberg certainly heralds modernity for opining – differently from Lavater – that the face serves as a sign only insofar as it is the evolving record of the accumulative effects of social, environmental, and historical circumstances – that is, external factors – upon an individual's preexistent being (see esp. Gray, "Die Geburt" 121-23; "Sign and *Sein*" 321-24), as far as the structure of his thought is concerned, he relies for his righteous remarks in his "Über Physiognomik; wider die Physiognomen" ("On Physiognomics; against Physiognomists" 1777/78) and his parody "Fragment von Schwänzen" ("Fragment on Tails," written 1777; published 1783) on the same tabular order and same relation external to the sign as does Lavater already for his biases in his ***Fragments*** (see also Geitner 370). Only Courtine and Haroche appear not to locate Lavater's "resurrection" of physiognomy incontrovertibly within the classical episteme but rather in a contrary place between it and modernity (118-21, 130-38). They emphasize the tensions about Lavater's work between "expressivity" and "organicity," yet ultimately assign the shift from the classical physiognomical preoccupation with character distinctions to the modern physiognomical determination of "historical and cultural distinction" more to Pierre (Petrus) Camper's *Dissertation sur les variétes naturelles qui caracterise la physionomie des hommes des divers climats et des différens ages* (*Dissertation on the Natural Varieties that Characterize the Physiognomy of Men from Diverse Climates and Different Ages*, written 1768; published 1786) in which the sign (i.e., race, nationality, etc.) no longer appears unified with the structure of the face, but becomes inscribed there as "an organic law" explaining one's place in the order of species (esp. 124; see also MacLeod, "Floating Heads" 75-76; Stafford 111-15). I contend that we must locate Lavater, like Camper, as a classical pundit whose manner of postulations place him on the very threshold of modern ambition. Until the appearance of his treatises, the individual external features of faces had operated exclusively in facilitating the decoding and location of virtue and vice in the physiognomical analysis of human nature. But the modification of these elements in the event of the face coming together again to be perceived and understood essentially as an 'identifiable' and 'utilizable' *whole* provides the foundation for a new, modern episteme that is concerned less with noticeable visibilities and more with useful function. To return to our underlying example of the study of natural history and biology in *The Order of Things*, Foucault explains while discussing Georges Baron de Cuvier's modern treatment of living beings and their organs in contrast to Jussieu's classical analysis that "before defining organs by their [morphological] variables, we must relate them to the functions they perform. Now, these functions are relatively few in number: respiration, digestion, circulation, locomotion ... So the visible diversity of structures no longer emerges from the background of a table of variables, but from the background of a few great functional units capable of being realized and of accomplishing their aims in various ways" (264).

Lavater's use of sketched profiles and preference for silhouettes manifest this gradual disregard for the physical elements of surface structure in favor of social principles.[21] In fact, the silhouette may be regarded at this point as a literal and concrete illustration of this shift since it is very much consistent with Foucault's remarks that "representation has lost the power to provide a foundation ... for the links that can join its various elements together ... The condition of these links resides henceforth outside representation, beyond its immediate visibility, in a sort of behind-the-scenes world even deeper and more dense than representation itself" (238-39). Indeed, it is a fiction that silhouettes command a sense of representationality since they do not faithfully reiterate the content of that which they signify. The silhouette is not transparent with its object, but rather actually extinguishes the subjective agency of the physical features in the wake of its concurrence as a shadow. The silhouette reduces any emerging individual (referent) to an identity, rejects any independent person for a social type. Those people projected as silhouettes are known exclusively by their composite shadow faces whose entirety now subordinates and blurs external features, they are transcribed as dark and yet intelligible voids since they are performed by the sheer function of identity (that which is already supplied by the physiognomist's prejudicial 'perception'). Hence it is not as an exact duplication but as an elusive double, as a doppelgänger, that the face emerges at the beginning of the modern era.

---

[21] See especially Weissberg (300-01). Gray explains Lavater's use of silhouettes as an effect of his determinist quest after the stable, authentic individual unencumbered by the arbitrary signs of expression and volitional acts ("Die Geburt" 134-35; "Sign and *Sein*" 315). See Baxandall for discussions of eighteenth-century empiricist notions and observations of the shadow in regard to the visual experience of shape (chs. II & IV). For further remarks on Lavater and silhouettes, see Courtine/Haroche (132); Fischer/Stumpp (129-30); Pestalozzi (145); Sauerländer (18-19); and Schmölders (249-54, 256, 28-59). For the popularity of silhouettes at the time of Goethe and Lavater's part in it, see Bräuning-Oktavio (3-27); Hickman (18-19); Kroeber (9-15).

Here lies the significant difference between Lavater and the earlier classical physiognomical classifiers. The Swiss physiognomist has shifted to a relation external to the sign to establish an order of nature: the elements of certain kinds of identities will form the basis of an ordering of human nature. From his work on, representation no longer refers to itself. The relation external to the composition of the sign (abstract social relations or aspects of the face) supplies knowledge of the object of study (human nature or, simply, humanity) in that it is understood by the function (identity) it performs. The social identity lodged in the face now predicates the structure of any person: the general assumptions of the qualities of a poet, of women, of the subject of a certain nation are the elements confirmed in the face and that designate, limit, and control what is known of (their) human nature.

Such a modification in positive empiricity (which is perhaps explained by the pluralizations and polarizations in society, class, sex, gender, and nation) will eventually have the effect of no longer providing the interactively representational means necessary for forming a table of constantly parallel phenomena. Instead, some of the abstract social relations of identity will still figure simultaneously while others set up series. Thus, as Foucault has already pointed out, "analogy" and "succession" will replace classical difference and sameness as those relations that organize empirical data in the modern epoch. Accordingly, the tabular order of the eighteenth-century structure of thought will yield to the space of history in the nineteenth-century episteme. Just as Foucault's discussion in *The Order of Things* observes that natural history or an analysis of living beings turns into biology or an analysis of organically structured beings at the beginning of the nineteenth century, so does this study maintain that classical physiognomy or the analysis of human nature becomes modern physiognomy or the analysis of socially organized humanity. Indeed, modern physiognomy does not attempt to decode the nature of any human. Rather, it will try to provide the empirical reasoning to locate that same human in a certain place in society (see also Courtine/Haroche 104-05).

Part Two: A Genealogy of the Identity of Artist-Intellectuals

The Swiss pastor Johann Caspar Lavater's voluminous contribution to the discipline of physiognomy both greatly popularized it and, as seen above, reinvented it. In the first part of this introduction I argued that the physiognomy of the late-classical and modern periods is a system in which prejudice makes known the respective nature and rank of a person by substantiating the sign of that person's face. Lavater set about arranging elements in order to assemble people in groups and then divided those groups into a social order. His work did not simply undertake the task of recognizing external, physical emanations as the instructive parts of representations of certain moral traits so as to unmask human nature and, particularly, deceitful characters in the midst of a tabulation of society as had been typically the case in the classical episteme. Rather, it endeavored to see, categorize, and know all humanity. Instead of relying on elements internal to the sign of the face, Lavater appropriated the external abstract social relation of identity. This change implied that the condition that supplied the link between the representation and the knowledge it demonstrates was now to lie outside the representation itself. The elements of identity – a person's social, that is, class, ethnic, gender, or occupational function – thus came to support the structure of the face and allowed it to be catalogued in an order which 'naturally' reveals a person's nature. By allocating an idealized sketch or silhouette and corresponding description of the face to each and every 'soul' from the different classes, professions, sexes, and nations, Lavater provided simulations not only of numerous possible character variations, but also of every social stratum and every walk of life.

Such an analysis of identities does not so much decode a person's virtuous or vicious nature (as was the case with Cureau, Scheuchzer, Pernety, etc.) as it initiates a general order of humans (cf. Gray "Die Geburt" 308-09; "Sign and *Sein*" 308-09; Shookman, "Pseudo-Science" 3). It appears that Lavater was not satisfied with simply drawing out certain traits from the faces of particular individuals independent of one another and so constructed or fixed certain features and faces as representations of a particular hierarchy of human nature.

To an extent, this order was to correspond with, and reiterate, an already existing social hierarchy. It is in this way that Lavater redirected the political technology of physiognomy from an aesthetic discourse on an individual's nature to a social discourse on *one's rightful place*. His physiognomical treatises enabled – under the guise of a scientific decoding of human nature and detection of moral disposition – the construction and comprehensive classification of the face in accordance with a desire to represent, stratify, and moderate whole sections of society. Though Lavater might have proclaimed nothing but the best of intentions – "a long time ago, however, [I] accustomed myself particularly to tracing and determining only ever the beautiful, the noble, the good, and the perfect"[1] – it soon becomes evident in this study that his cumulative results have the potential of leaving a very different impression upon society.

As the abovementioned examples of the poet, women, and the Pole demonstrate, in Lavater's scheme of things a person's role tends to supply their nature and so they can only occupy a certain place in society: an ever-elastic poet perceives god's work and reveals it to the cultivated man whose nature it is presumably to busy himself with such concerns. His warm-hearted wife comforts him as he reflects upon such concerns. By contrast, it is the lot of the uncultivated Pole to have no dealings with such concerns as he goes about his way merrily herding cattle. It appears, then, that to know a poet, a woman, a Pole is to be able to distinguish one's own relation to them. It is, of course, taken for granted that any interested reader of physiognomical treatises is at the same time, and by association or implication, unremittedly a lay physiognomist. Indeed, the institution of physiognomy is an analysis of the social organization of humanity and the placement of all other humans as an integral part of both the physiognomist's and the physiognomical reader's desire to know and affirm the standing of his own knowledge, civilization, and breeding.

The physiognomist is thus someone who is, at bottom, the sum and effect of relations with the identities, faces, and natures he judges and divines (cf. Matt esp. 1, 53, 98-99; Pestalozzi 146; Schmölders 257). Thus in order to know the institution of representations that is physiognomy it is necessary to investigate the power-knowledge relations that inform those representations. It is necessary to examine – whether they are correct or incorrect – how the external relations or rhetorical elements of others' identities are produced in the dynamic of physiognomical knowledge-formation. That is, one must ask questions about the physiognomist's consideration of himself from the perspective of his consideration of others.

---

[1] "gewöhnte mich aber besonders seit langem, immer nur das Schöne, das Edle, das Gute und Vollkommne aufzuspüren, zu bestimmen" (20). He also mentions a little later "That no human soul has anything to fear before my gaze, because I look for the good in everyone and find good in everyone" ("Daß sich keine Menschenseele vor meinem Blicke zu fürchten hat, weil ich bey allen Menschen auf das Gute sehe, und an allen Menschen Gutes finde," 21).

The elements of identity, which are at the same time the materialization of the physiognomist's relation to his subject-matter, are used by the physiognomist in the pretense of knowing better the natures of those about him.[2] However, this endeavor is a foil for the physiognomist's desire to feel better about himself. In regard to this self-validating aspect of physiognomy, Ellis Shookman draws attention to certain characters in Johann Karl Musäus's satirical novel *Physiognomische Reisen* (*Physiognomical Journeys*, 1778-79) who are driven by "their own egoistic calculations" (Shookman, "Pseudo-Science" 9). Musäus's text states that "No one can dispute that physiognomy is a satisfying intellectual game, which is all the more interesting for imperceptibly drawing every observer's own personality into play. We mentally measure ourselves against every face we meet, for we tacitly assume that this comparison can never turn out to our disadvantage, but must always be to our good and profit."[3]

The physiognomist is primarily concerned with the superiority of his own circle in regard to other members of the social fabric. The discipline of physiognomy is a means of having intellectual authority over the face, that is, the identity of others for the sake of asserting one's own superiority – or the superiority of one's intellectual class (see also Gray, "Die Geburt" 102; "Sign and *Sein*" 311) – without confronting any unnecessary resistance. The following quotation is a blunt illustration of this very point:

---

[2] "To know yourself, your fellow man, and the creator of both better"; "*Dich und deinen Nebenmenschen, und den Schöpfer von beyden besser zu kennen*" (9). The subtitle of the project also expresses this intention: "to further knowledge of human nature" ("zur Beförderung der Menschenkenntnis").

[3] The translation is Shookman's (9); Musäus writes in the original German: "Kein Mensch kan in Abrede seyn, daß [die Physiognomik] dem Geiste eine befriedigende Unterhaltung gewähre, die darum desto interessanter ist, weil sie eines ieden Beschauers eigne Persönlichkeit unvermerkt ins Studium mit hinein zieht. Wir messen uns in Gedanken mit iedem Kopf der uns vorkommt ... Denn stillschweigend haben wir mit unserm Witz die Convention getroffen, das [*sic*] dieser Vergleich nie zu unserm Nachtheil, sondern immer zu unserm Gewinn und Vortheil ausfallen muß" (116-17).

> Sound human reason is indeed outraged by anyone who can claim that Newton or Leibniz could have ever looked like someone from a lunatic asylum who cannot manage a firm step or mediating gaze; and who is incapable of understanding the simplest of abstract propositions or of expressing himself in a comprehensible manner; that one of these could have conceived the Theodicea in the skull of a Lapp, and the other have weighed the planets and split the beam of light in the head of a Labrador Eskimo who can only count as far as six and considers uncountable anything past this?[4]

Instead of genuinely demonstrating another's nature, physiognomy classifies, surveys, and controls those others with elaborate descriptions, rough sketches, diagrammatic dissections, and reductive silhouettes of faces in a taxonomical gallery of performative identities that encodes all human beings denying them the right or possibility of representing themselves. Physiognomy is a complex social function, a system of control, that encodes the face in order to help determine the limited freedom of some, while adorning others with the privilege of beauty, sincerity, virtue, intelligence and, ultimately, success.

Lavater's close acquaintances and his collaborators or associates on the *Fragments* tend to do very well by the Swiss's system. For example, Goethe's "nose is the very expression of productivity, taste, and love, that is, of poetry;" his face expresses "the high-floating genius of a poet."[5] We have already seen above how Zimmermann, though not a poet, is apparently well-disposed for the appreciation of poetry and, likewise, his daughter is celebrated for her exemplary womanliness. Similarly, in national physiognomy, the Germans and English fair better than the Dutch, French or Italians, but Europeans and Christians in general do better than non-Europeans and Jews (see Wechsler). In fact, the faces of the human objects of study in this pseudoscientific venture are compartmentalized in order – depending on the face – either to limit their participation in the world's affairs or to sanction and further promote their relative social standing and contribution to culture and civilization.

---

[4] "Der gesunde Menschenverstand empört sich in der That gegen einen Menschen, der behaupten kann: daß *Neuton* und *Leibnitz* allenfalls ausgesehen haben könnten, wie ein Mensch im Tollhause, der keinen festen Tritt, keinen beobachtenden Blick thun kann; und nicht vermögend ist, den gemeinsten abstrakten Satz zu begreifen, oder mit Verstand auszusprechen; daß der eine von ihnen im Schädel eines Lappen die *Theodicee* erdacht, und der andere im Kopfe eines Labradoriers, der weiter nicht, als auf sechse zählen kann, und was drüber geht, unzählbar nennt, die Planeten gewogen und den Lichtstrahl gespaltet hätte?" (34). Practically the same passage occurs in Lavater's 1772 essay *Von der Physiognomik*, with the main difference being that the Eskimo of the later version has substituted the Moor of the earlier one (see esp. Gilman, "Lavater" 49-51; and Zelle 42). This, of course, is the very passage at which Lichtenberg takes the most offense in his "Über Physiognomik; wider die Physiognomen" ("On Physiognomy; Against the Physiognomists"). In pointing out the racism of these remarks and the reliance of these men's achievements on their social circumstances, Lichtenberg ultimately questions Lavater's intellectual authority over faces and, so, not only shows the prejudice and falsehood of certain physiognomical assertions, but also undermines Lavater's delimitation of physiognomists.

In *Discipline and Punish*, Michel Foucault suggests that the social institutions created in the Enlightenment and nineteenth century – among which physiognomy must also be considered – do not represent the very foundations of a free society of individuals, but rather are a part of a "micro-physics of power," a means of exercising social control. Like Foucault's treatment of "the metamorphosis of punitive methods" in his study, for example, I regard the reinvention of physiognomy "on the basis of a political technology of the body in which might be read a common history of power relations and object relations" (24). That is, I am concerned with the "body politic" of physiognomy "as a set of material elements and techniques that serve as ... supports for the power and knowledge relations that invest human bodies and subjugate them by turning them into objects of knowledge" (28). Indeed, the change in the focus of punishment from spectacular bodily torture to the judicial and bureaucratic reformation of the soul, which Foucault observes and explains, finds further remarkable evidence in Lavater's "criminal physiognomy." Here Lavater suggests that training law students and judges in the practice of physiognomy will eventually make redundant the need for torture since the legal profession will then be able to know the criminal element in the population simply by observing faces and, so, may even embark on preventative initiatives by analyzing young people (*Fragmente* 4:474-75; see Zelle 53-55).

---

[5] "Die Nase – voll Ausdruck von Produktifität – Geschmack und Liebe – Das heißt von Poesie" (235); "die dichterische hochaufschwebende Genialität" (242).

Hence I situate the allocation of faces to social types in the history of physiognomical practices less as a consequence of moral, aesthetic, or social theories than as an episode of theoretical discourse. The knowledge of physiognomy is, therefore, an apparatus of ideology.

Though at first glance the aim of physiognomy appears to be the divination of human nature, it is the construction of the face that always remains at issue. Indeed, physiognomy must be analyzed not as a consequence or indication of the supposed genuine congruity of a variety of facial features with the mind, heart, or soul, but rather as a "political technology" or tactic for expressing power. Thus a history of the material elements of physiognomy necessarily charts the inevitable success of certain people over the unavoidable despair of others. Like that of Polemo, the work of Lavater and his successors mobilizes social opinion in favor of the position of a certain hegemony while frustrating the chances of success and social or political destiny of other groups in society. Where Johann Caspar Lavater is concerned, I reveal that hegemony not to be the dominant ruling classes, the nobility, but rather artists, intellectuals, and other cultural producers such as physiognomists (cf. Gray, "Sign and *Sein*" 309-11).

I have already observed that, according to Lavater, a poet's contribution to society is to act as mediator between god's work and man's faculties of observation and comprehension. In fact, by Lavater's definition, the poet is a prophet, a middleman, and, so, very much resembles a spiritual leader or member of the clergy. Consequently, it appears that, since Lavater was not only a physiognomist but also a pastor, he must, first of all, have a relation of sameness with the poet, and that, because the poet is highly placed in his order of human nature, it must go without saying that Lavater's own position in the table of human society is, ultimately, likewise of the highest order. Just as poets can read the divine language of, and so reveal, god's work, so must physiognomists since, according to Lavater, the human face is the image of god, the divine language with which resurrected souls communicate in heaven.[6] Intriguingly, Lichtenberg refers to physiognomists as "apostles," and to their supporters as "disciples and demigods" (qtd. in S. Frey 98). Though this divine language is written on the face for all to see and, so, essentially reveals itself to the physiognomist, according to Lavater, it takes a "sound," that is, talented or educated eye ("ein gesundes Auge") to see correctly:

---

[6] In his ***Aussichten in die Ewigkeit, in Briefen an Herrn Johann Georg Zimmermann*** (1768-78) Lavater explains that the language of heavenly souls "is physiognomic, pantomimic, musical ... I shall begin with 'physiognomic.' Just as Christ is the most graphic, most vivid, most perfect image of invisible God, an image where everything is expression, everything has unfathomable and infinite meaning, such a truthful,

> I do not promise (since to do so would be folly and would make no sense) to proffer the alphabet with its thousands of letters so as to decipher [either] the instinctive language of nature in the human countenance and entire exterior or even only the beauty and perfection of the human face; however, I do [believe I am able to] draw out some of the letters of this divine alphabet in such a legible manner that any sound eye will be able to discover and recognize them wherever they appear before it.[7]

It is perhaps not surprising to learn that the greatest diviners of faces will necessarily exhibit the greatest of faces to divine: "Without a good physiognomy, no one will become a good physiognomist ... Just as the most virtuous can best judge virtue, the righteous that which is just, so those with the best faces are most suited to judge the goodness, beauty, and

---

unfathomable expression that the supreme archangel's successive description in words, lasting through all eternity, could not achieve the wealth and sublimity of this expression – could not, that is, cause the impression that the original makes, in only a few moments, on whoever is capable of understanding it – so, too, is every human being (an image of God and Christ) thus entirely expression – expression that is instantaneous, truthful, comprehensive, unfathomable, impossible to attain in words, and inimitable. Such a human being is entirely natural language" (trans. Siegrist, "Letters" 27); "Diese Sprache ist physiognomisch, pantomimisch, musicalisch ... Ich mache den Anfang bey der physiognomischen. Wie Christus das redendste, lebendigste, vollkommenste Ebenbild des unsichtbaren Gottes ist, ein Ebenbild, wo alles Ausdruck, alles von unerschöpflicher und unendlicher Bedeutung ist, ein so wahrhafter, unerschöpflicher Ausdruck, daß eine successive, durch alle Ewigkeiten fortgehende Wortbeschreibung des höchsten Erzengels den Reichtum und die Erhabenheit dieses Ausdruckes nicht erreichen, das ist: die Eindrücke nicht verursachen können, die das Urbild auf den, der dazu organisirt ist, es zu verstehen, in wenigen Augenblicken, machen muss, so ist jeder Mensch (ein Ebenbild Gottes und Christi) so ganz Ausdruck, gleichzeitger, wahrhafter, vielfassender, unerschöpflicher, mit keinen Worten erreichbarer, unnachahmbarer Ausdruck; er ist ganz Natursprache" (Lavater, *Werke* 1:183). For similar remarks on Lavater's physicotheology, see also Zelle (51-53). For a discussion of Lavater's understanding of god-given signs, see Rivers, *Face Value* (esp. 79, 94, 97). See Gray for a discussion of natural and arbitrary signs in the Enlightenment and their relation to Lavater's theories and physiognomy in general.

[7] "Ich verspreche nicht (denn solches zu versprechen wäre Thorheit und Unsinn) das tausendbuchstäbige Alphabeth zur Entzieferung der unwillkührlichen Natursprache im Antlitze, und dem ganzen Aeußerlichen des Menschen, oder auch nur der Schönheiten und Vollkommenheiten des menschlichen Gesichtes zu liefern; aber doch einige Buchstaben dieses göttlichen Alphabeths so leserlich vorzuzeichnen, daß jedes gesunde Auge dieselbe wird finden und erkennen können, wo sie ihm wieder vorkommen" (10).

nobility of human faces, and at the same time ... their ignobility and defectiveness."[8] As we have already seen, the person with the most beautiful face is a poet. At the end of the section "Physiognomical Exercises for Testing Physiognomical Genius," the reader arrives at a silhouette of an anonymous, though identifiable Goethe, "one of the greatest and richest geniuses" Lavater had ever seen (127). Later again, Lavater remarks upon a German poet whom one may presume to be Goethe: "If he had been nothing as a poet, what a valuable addition to physiognomy!"[9] The poet, the physiognomist, and the clergyman are thus beginning to form an exclusive intellectual club from whose vantage point they may authorize the nature and rank of all people. With their additional employ of painters and shared social or linguistic proximity to the divine, these cultural producers have devised in their reconditioning of physiognomical practices a grab for symbolic power perhaps unprecedented in the history of intellectuals. Hartmut Böhme remarks that physiognomy is a system of knowledge – whether of divine origin or manmade – that has become the possession of a select group of people (169-70). Not only do these cultural producers draw up society into a legible, divisible table of identities, but they use this very table to establish and confirm beyond any shadow of a doubt their own distinguished and superior position in that table. (Perhaps this occurs as a consequence of the end of the patronage of the artist by members of the aristocracy and of the need to define oneself in terms of or to integrate into the growing urban middle class; perhaps this occurs as a result of artists and theologians not wanting to lose ground to scientists.)

One may even say that late-eighteenth-century physiognomists entirely reinvent physiognomy and its meaning in their own self-interest. Lavater decontextualizes many of the specimens found in artworks cited in his *Fragments*, often using manipulated copies or carefully selected details made to suit meanings and purposes that bear little relation to their original meaning in art (see Sauerländer 24-26). When the images that afford the table of representations are not to the physiognomist's liking, that is, when Lavater is dissatisfied with the drawings and sketches that comprise his raw materials, as is the case with the images of Goethe, he simply takes the opportunity to fill in the faults with further description. This practice gives the impression of Lavater's omniscience. The political anatomy of physiognomy – the practices, terminology, and style grounding its representations – thus intends to mobilize its readers to support, approve, and sanction the privilege of a hegemony comprised of poets, physiognomists, clergymen, intellectual and artistic types, in fact, cultural producers of all stripes.

---

[8] "Keiner ohne gute Bildung wird ein guter Physiognomiste werden ... So wie die Tugendhaftesten am besten über Tugend, die Gerechten am besten über Gerechtigkeit urtheilen können, so die besten Gesichter am besten über das Gute, Schöne, und Edle der menschlichen Gesichter, mithin auch ... über das Unedle und Mangelhafte" (107-08).

[9] "Wär' er nichts als *Dichter*, welche Gewinnste für die Physiognomik!" (227).

The initial intended readers are not lacking in significant political or financial power either. From the preface to the *Fragments* it is plain to see that Lavater has only a rich and educated, that is, exclusive readership in mind: "By no means was [this work] written for the masses. It is not to be read nor to be bought by the common man. It is expensive because of its very nature; it is more expensive than other works with plates."[10] In fact, Zimmermann managed to compile a long list of advance subscriptions that included many members of the nobility whose names and titles Lavater then had published in the *Fragments* (S. Frey 78).[11] Lavater had a number of friends, colleagues, and contacts contribute descriptions, portraits, silhouettes, and engravings. These included, for example, along with the most famous collaborator Goethe, such figures as writers Johann Gottfried Herder, Friedrich Arnold Klockenbring, Jacob Michael Reinhold Lenz, Johann Heinrich Merck, Helfrich Peter Sturz, and Johann Georg Sulzer, and painters Daniel Chodowiecki, Giovanni-Francesco Cotta, Johann Heinrich Füssli, Samuel Gränicher, Johann Heinrich Lips, Johann Pfenninger, Johann Rudolf Schellenberg, Georg Friedrich Schmoll, Johann Heinrich Wilhelm Tischbein, and Johann Heinrich Voß. The *Fragments* received positive reviews from an assortment of illuminati in acclaimed scientific and scholarly publications, such as the *Deutsches Museum* (by Sturz), *Frankfurter gelehrte Anzeigen* (by Merck), the *Göttingische Anzeigen von*

---

[10] "[Dieses Werk] ist durchaus nicht für den großen Haufen geschrieben. Es soll von dem gemeinen Mann nicht gelesen und nicht gekauft werden. Es ist kostbar seiner Natur nach; kostbarer als andere Werke mit Kupfern" (8).

[11] Some earlier physiognomical treatises were dedicated to nobility (Tytler 41).

gelehrten Sachen (by Albrecht von Haller), the *Lemgoer Auserlesene Bibliothek der neuesten deutschen Literatur* (by Herder), and *Teutscher Merkur* (by Merck and by Christoph Martin Wieland) (S. Frey 83-85; Gray, "Die Geburt" 99-100; Saltzwedel 119-44; Siegrist, "Nachwort" 388-89; Tytler 74-75). In addition, Lavater's works reached a large audience across the classes – as a result of less expensive editions – and in numerous nations – through translations.[12] But the most significant point here is that Lavater's work, which insists on the high social standing of intellectuals, is also the means by which he may implicate himself in a symbolic system comprised of cultural producers and greater or lesser luminaries – from Goethe (only initially) to Füssli, Haller to Herder, Pfenninger to Zimmermann, and so on[13] – who recognize each other as cultural experts, with some – Lenz and Zimmermann – even prepared to defend the cause when attacked by Lichtenberg (S. Frey 94-95, 99).[14]

It is the material practices of physiognomy – its archives of silhouettes, outlines, busts, and death masks, its tables of examples, the reverent, even pietistic, rhetoric and archival nature of the texts, its conventionalization at court or in the drawing rooms of middle-class homes as a parlor game, the invention of a machine for drawing silhouettes or special calipers for measuring the forehead – that is, it is how its specificities elaborate and reduce the face to an identity-function that enables the hegemony of artists and intellectuals to institute and publicly disseminate their own social function also as controlling authorities and the rightful holders of power.[15] The elements of the respective professional roles are supposedly contained in the face, which, when subsequently ordered alongside others, makes that position of authority clearly perceptible as if it were natural. This, of course, is nothing but the ultimate and intoxicating expression of artists and intellectuals' power to define the world as they see it and, while they are at it, to define themselves and their own place in that world.

---

[12] Judith Wechsler discusses the variations, changes, and expansions concerning racial and ethnic stereotyping between the original and the English and French translations. She remarks that "Our reading of Lavater's prejudices should not overlook such shifts in emphasis due to his editors' and translators' own notions of nation and race" (105). I would add that variations are to be expected since the translations are geared to a relatively different audience and serve a slightly new hegemony (cf. 117).

[13] Lavater's insinuation into an esteemed circle of living and contributing cultural producers is not to mention his treatises' self-acknowledging function in relation to the numerous dead or established artists whose works they also reproduce. These include, for example, François Boucher, Albrecht Dürer, Le Brun, William Hogarth, Hans Holbein, Michelangelo, Nicolas Poussin, Raphael, Rembrandt, Joshua Reynolds, Peter Paul Rubens, Anthony Van Dyke, Leonardo da Vinci, Benjamin West. Cf. Schmölders (248).

[14] For Lavater's relationship with Goethe, see S. Frey (74, 76-77, 81-82, 88, 101); Guinaudeau; Matt (69-70, 81-82); Saltzwedel (214-29); Siegrist, "Letters" (36-38); and Tytler (18-20). For his relationship with Haller, see Kunz (17-23); and Tytler (18). For his relationship with Herder, see Frey (73, 75-76, 85, 100); Saltzwedel (163-71); and Tytler (18). And for his relationship with Zimmermann, see S. Frey (68-79, 83, 85-86, 94, 99-100); Kunz (29-37); and Tytler (17-18).

Lavater's remark "that I possess very little physiognomical knowledge; that I have erred in my judgment countless times, and still do every day" is a standard disclaimer that in no way undermines his status as a cultural authority.[16] Rather, such words lay emphasis on Lavater's abundantly apparent talent. Despite any claim to the contrary, Lavater is a self-validating cultural producer. Noting that physiognomy is often defined as an innate ability in the true physiognomist, Christopher Rivers observes that "one might find oneself wondering why the *Physiognomische Fragmente* should have been written at all" ("'L'homme hiéroglyphié'"156). To this I would reply that Lavater, consciously or otherwise, wrote his physiognomical treatises in the context of a cultural network of intellectuals who sought to gain power and influence in and over society. The *Fragments* are a complex discursive mechanism by which one may reconfigure society in order to promote the lot of intellectuals.

In Lavater's work, faces and their descriptions basically amount to a work of art or cultural product. Lavater occupies the unique position of being their (re-/)producer and critic. As Pierre Bourdieu explains in *The Field of Cultural Production*, the principle of the artworks lying in the field of the conditions of cultural production does not have anything to do with economics, rather it has everything to do with art and the intelligentsia (35). Art is neither a pure creation nor a representative of a dominant socioeconomic class (as Walter

---

[15] See Weissberg's excellent comparison of Lavater's silhouette machine with Jeremy Bentham's panoptikum as explained by Foucault (Weissberg 307-09).

[16] "*daß ich sehr wenige physiognomische Kenntniß besitze; daß ich mich unzählige male in meinen Urtheilen geirret habe, und noch täglich irre*" (15).

Benjamin might have regarded it[17]). Rather, art exists as the effect of the acknowledgment as art – the discourses about art and its own legitimacy. He goes on:

> All critics declare not only their judgement of the work but also their claim to the right to talk about it and judge it. In short, they take part in a struggle for the monopoly of the legitimate discourse about the work of art, and consequently in the production of the value of the work of art. (And one's only hope of producing scientific knowledge ... is to make explicit to oneself one's position in the sub-field of the producers of discourse about art and the contribution of this field to the very existence of the object of study.) (36)

Bourdieu insists that the aesthetic gaze is connected to the social agent of art as an object of contemplation that enables the establishment of professionals assigned the important job of conserving art as keepers, renovators, commentators, and critics (36). Thus the aesthetic gaze looks and describes with the express intent of asserting the importance of the person in the position to define that look; it is a strategy that subordinates the work of art to the benefit of the existence of producers and keepers of the value of cultural products. Consequently, according to Bourdieu, the artwork exists only if it is recognized as such and the study of art, therefore, must account not only for material production but also for symbolic production, that is, not only for the producers of work such as artists, but for producers of value such as critics who inform us of how to recognize a work of art (37).

Because of his position in the structure of class, ethnic, power, and cultural relations, Lavater's work is a subjective endeavor both to present the world as it appears to *him* as well as to position himself not only as that authority most suitable for making apparently reliable representations of the world, but also as an authority on who is most suitable to be such an authority. Bourdieu clarifies the situation of artists and intellectuals (and here one should also bear in mind the physiognomist):

> The preliminary reflections on the definitions of the object and the boundaries of the population, which studies of writers, artists and, especially, intellectuals, often

---

[17] See Benjamin's essay "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction."

> indulge in so as to give themselves an air of scientificity, ignore the fact, which is more than scientifically attested, that the definition of the writer (or artist, etc.) is an issue at stake in struggles in every literary (or artistic, etc.) field. In other words, the field of cultural production is the site of struggles in which what is at stake is the power to impose the dominant definition of the writer and therefore to delimit the population of those entitled to take part in the struggle to define the writer [or artist, etc.]. (41-42)

Lavater indulges in definitions of the population and reality to give himself scientific authority over populations as that kind of person most entitled to express that population; it is the definition of the physiognomist that is at stake in all productions and representations: it "is the monopoly of the power to say with authority who are authorized to call themselves [artists, physiognomists, intellectuals, etc.] ... it is the monopoly of the power to consecrate producers" (Bourdieu 42).

In this way the discourse of physiognomy enables effect to become cause: the artist-intellectual who is essentially the effect of relations with other faces also precedes all faces since those faces are representations defined by the artist. This may include his own, albeit somewhat inconspicuously. As Juliet McMaster espies, the frontispiece portrait of Lavater in the English translation of his work is repeated later "in the second row, centre, of a page illustrating Swiss physiognomy" (16). The author-physiognomist maintains his anonymity while clearly indicating *his* natural authority: "The love of labour, innocent benevolence, tender irritability, and strength of imagination, are some of the ideas read in this short-sighted, and, apparently, enquiring eye, which seems to speak what all eyes easily understand" (Lavater, *Essays* 427; compare 124; see also Graham, *Lavater's Essays* 45-46).

Physiognomy is thus an intellectual strategy of knowledge-formation that, perhaps like all cultural products, makes any participation in it a compulsory passive adherence to the notion of the superior and insightful intelligence of its producer, the physiognomist, that is, an artist-intellectual. The destiny and identity of artists and intellectuals, then, is recorded by an epistemology of physiognomy, since it is, above all, in this pseudoscientific discourse that identity is the correlative, an emanation of a relation, of a certain system of technology of power over the face. It is by accounting for the repressive historical conditions of physiognomical discourse while simultaneously demonstrating the emergence from these conditions of the symbolic power of artists, that I undertake a strategic history or genealogical explanation of the identity of artists and intellectuals as they regroup at the threshold of the modern age. In fact, the new tactical formation of physiognomical behavior may be understood as a powerful exercise in intellectual self-portrait.

Part Three: The Specter of the Face

As maintained by the archaeology of physiognomy undertaken in the first part of this project, in the eighteenth century the mode of being of the face as the physical site of human nature was defined in terms of representation. But toward the end of the eighteenth century the internal relations of representation – that is, the observable differences between facial features that guaranteed the representation – seemed to collapse or fail since they were considered no longer sufficient by themselves for the demonstration of their knowledge. Representation and classification began to rely on relations outside the sign. In his example of the discursive practices of natural history, Foucault observed a move to "organic structures" to provide the differentiating elements with which to substantiate the representation of living beings. Similarly, physiognomy modified the use of visible features as those elements responsible for linking the parts of the representation and enabling its meaningful tabulation among comparable signs. This study noticed that the face, no longer referring purely and simply to its external self, was reengineered as an identifiable and utilizable whole that consisted of a set of elements (or was located in one synecdochic feature[1]) pertaining to an identity-function and informed by abstract social relations (to others as types). These elements now begin to assist the face as a representation and, therefore, the taxonomy of the nature of all members of humanity. Thus, as the face emerged at the end of the eighteenth century, its constituent, individually discernable physical features, the visible exteriority of an inner nature, were consumed by a predicating function performed by the face-as-a-whole. Physiognomy subtended the decoding of character with the encoding of the face, as a composite image, as that means by which to allocate a proper place in society for everyone: each person would find his or her ghostly counterpart in the official physiognomical tables of society.

---

[1] See also Matt, who sees this particular development – the focus on one synecdochic feature that stands in for an entire physiognomy, and whose meaning comes to name metonymically the whole person – occurring later in the nineteenth century (128-30). See also Rivers's discussion of synecdoche (*Face Value* 86).

Foucault remarks that, though initially being used to establish "character" for the purposes of taxonomy, such a modification – the subordination of intrinsic by outside elements – in the operations of thought structures provides the necessary conditions for the emergence of the modern episteme. Indeed, during the nineteenth century, the social relations of the face will gradually be considered less in terms of their provision of elements for the analysis of difference and sameness. Rather, the social relations or overall types of faces will be understood almost exclusively in terms of the practical social function they perform. That is, the observable features of faces are not simply subordinated to the function of identity for the sake of guaranteeing the representationality or consistency of the face as a sign of the natural disposition written on it. Nor can they be entirely dismissed. However, the physicalities of the face are denied a priori significance as their relevance is drastically reduced in favor of the matter of function. The form of the face will be consequential to discourse. Faces will come to take on their identities as opposed to supplying them. Just as, according to Foucault, "the soul is the prison of the body" (*Discipline* 30), identity is *the specter of the face*, that invention of a relation, that incorporeal spirit that stares out from the representation of the face.

As a result of the shift from the primary importance of physicality to that of functionality, the order of knowledge of the nature of human faces will gradually surrender its reliance for its comprehensibility on a system of consecutive or parallel comparisons forming a taxonomy of representations. Rather, the possibility of an ordered knowledge of human nature, that is, of one's place in society, will depend on the affirmations of functional similarities or analogies. Thus some faces may have nothing physically in common with each other and yet are grouped together as types because they are nonetheless seen to express similar identities. The modern understanding of a person is thus someone whose function entirely predicts the way their appearance is regarded since identity becomes the category that defines the object of physiognomical analysis.

It is important to realize that representation does not disappear. It is just no longer able to justify itself by self-reference. It is dependent on other forces. And it is this reliance of representation on matters outside itself that opens up any object to make it vulnerable to its manipulation by those seeking to maintain their power by the production of knowledge. In the second part of this study of the face, I demonstrated how such a system of knowledge-formation that tended to set an order to humanity based on relative differences between physical identities was liable to reiterate an existing social hierarchy. Consequently, physiognomy became, over a relatively short period of time, the discursive analysis and reaffirmation not of the ethicoaesthetic, but of the socioaesthetic organization of humanity of which the primary operation was to ground the superiority of a certain group of people over all others. Since all entries in this taxonomy were essentially relative to their judge and diviner, it seems almost inevitable that it was in the interests of physiognomists and their immediate intellectual associates that modern physiognomy became instituted. For a certain time at any rate, physiognomy, by dint of a holy alliance between the physiognomist and the poet, was an integral part of the cultural intelligentsia's means of self-validation and sense of authority, influence, and power. It at once promoted cultural producers with their divine talent through the ranks of society and denied all others the possibility of self-representation. But the question arises whether those intellectual associates of physiognomists, namely poets or writers, adopt physiognomy as a means of validating the cultural producers who appear as characters in their works and, so, by association, also validate themselves.

In raising this question, I do not wish only to reinterpret the story lines of various novels from the perspective of the treatment of the faces that appear in them.[2] Rather, I intend to investigate the descriptions and narrative treatment of faces in novels as material elements and techniques used to define and determine artists, intellectuals, as well as other members of society. In this way I hope to discover how those faces (and those novels) contribute to or qualify the physiognomic system of control that affirms both the intellectual's authority over the face and, consequently, the symbolic superiority of the artist-intellectual. Hence I wish to trace the involvement of the profession of authors in a trend that has the potential of furthering their own interests. I shall explore the extent to which certain authors in certain texts participate in a cultural cause that ultimately only legitimizes and promotes their symbolic power and influence.

---

[2] For the influence of Lavater's theories, as well as of physiognomy in general, on facial descriptions in German letters, see Appel; Cormon (60-65, 101-05); Groddeck/Stadler; Heier; Käuser; Matt; Neumann; Niekerk; Riemann (esp. 217-85); Saltzwedel; Shookman ("Pseudo-Science" 9-16); Tytler; Wenger; and Wöbkemeier.

The tactical move on the part of artist-intellectuals in physiognomical discourse does indeed find a parallel in the development of the novel. This may not necessarily come as a surprise since it is this literary genre that expresses as one of its main concerns the development and nature of the artist or intellectual. While physiognomy continues throughout the nineteenth century to assert sociopsychological hierarchies by practical similarities in identities largely without questioning the foundations of its empirical process of representation,[3] novels act as the site of a generally more reflective appropriation of the face as a mode of representation. The texts of four well-known novels – *Werther*, *Sternbald*, *Kater Murr*, and *Maler Nolten* – all published between 1774 and 1832, a span of just under sixty years that includes the cusp of the classical age and the first decades of modernity, contain instances that show the impact of and different takes on – the praise for, elaboration or subversion of – Lavater's physiognomical system of asserting intellectual and artistic credentials.

Some novels take things literally at face value. Tieck's *Franz Sternbalds Wanderungen* (*Franz Sternbald's Journeys*, 1798) demonstrates a straightforward participation in a rhetorical practice that paints an idealistic picture in order to foreground the noble artist. In fact, the text appears to be concerned with the recognition of the true artist. The stature of an artist is directly comparable to the size, strength, and composure of his appearance. Particular attention is given to the eyes, the forehead, and curly hair. Lucas van Leiden, though an admirable artist, is not quite what Franz had imagined: "In conversation, Lucas was a merrier, happier man, his eyes were very lively, and his every single word was accompanied and explained by the ever-changing expressions on his face.

---

[3] The most prominent among the nineteenth-century physiognomists and perhaps the 'purest' – by which I mean the one who least digresses from the study of unmoving structure to expression – is Carl Gustav Carus. Tytler is right to draw attention to Carus's own comparison of his work with that of Cuvier (Tytler 87), for the synecdochic approach of Carus's work certainly aligns it with the modern episteme as defined by Foucault using the example of Cuvier, in spite of his similarities to Lavater (cf. Gray, "Sign and *Sein*" 305, 316-17). For a list of nineteenth-century physiognomical works, see especially Tytler (87, 348-50n16-17); and Gray ("Sign and *Sein*" 305-06).

Franz could still not take his eyes off him, since he had imagined him to be quite different. He had expected to see a large, strong, and serious man, but found before him a small, very agile, though almost sickly figure whose each and every word bore the mark of a cheerful and free disposition."[4] Once compared physiognomically to Albrecht Dürer, there is no doubt as to who is the greater and who the lesser of the two artists:

> Franz noticed how Albert's composure and the peaceful way by which he derived his pleasure very much contrasted [Lucas's] lively restlessness. Even when they stood next to one another, Franz took delight in the sheer difference between the two artists who nonetheless had so often appeared to coincide in their works. Dürer was large and slim, his curly hair fell charmingly and majestically about his temples, his face was venerable and yet friendly, his expressions changed his appearance only slowly, and his beautiful brown eyes shone out glowingly and yet gently from beneath his brow. Franz clearly noticed how there was a remarkable resemblance between the outlines of Albert's face and those with which the Redeemer of the world was usually depicted. Next to Albert, Lucas appeared even smaller than he really was; his expression changed all the time, his eyes were livelier than expressive, his light brown hair was cut short and simple around his head.[5]

Even before Rudolf Florestan sings and his name is known, the physiognomical signals of a particular kind of forehead, hair, and eyes should make it clear to the reader – just as it seems to do to Franz – that Florestan is an artist-figure of no insignificant talent: "[Franz] could not remove his gaze from the young man. The cheerful, bright brown eyes, the curly hair, a clear forehead and, on top of that, a colorful and foreign costume made him the very object of Franz's curiosity."[6] Similarly, as Franz, who throughout the work seems to suffer from a generally low self-esteem, gradually begins to earn recognition for his artistic abilities, so is there a noticeable change in his entire demeanor. Drawing attention, among other things, to Franz's eyes and his involvement in a network of artists, the narrator remarks that Leonore is happy to accompany Franz at Rustici's celebration "since Franz was in the prime of his life. His appearance was merry, his eyes glowed, his cheeks were full of color, his step and gait were noble, almost proud. He had almost completely discarded his humility and diffidence, which until then had still always made him recognizable as a foreigner. He no longer became embarrassed, as he used to, whenever a painter praised his work, because he had got used to that as well."[7]

---

[4] "Lukas war in seinem Gespräche ein muntrer, fröhlicher Mann, seine Augen waren sehr lebhaft, und seine schnellveränderlichen Mienen begleiteten und erklärten jedes seiner Worte. Franz konnte ihn noch immer nicht genug betrachten, denn in seiner Einbildung hatte er sich ihn ganz anders gedacht, er hatte einen großen, starken, ernsthaften Mann erwartet, und nun sah er eine kleine, sehr behende, aber fast kränkliche Figur vor sich, dessen Reden alle das Gepräge eines lustigen freien Gemütes trugen" (94-95).

[5] "Franz bemerkte, wie gegen diese lebhafte Unruhe [von Lukas] Alberts Gelassenheit und seine stille Art, sich zu freuen, schön kontrastierte. Auch wenn sie nebeneinanderstanden, ergötzte sich Franz an der gänzlichen Verschiedenheit der beiden Künstler, die sich doch in ihren Werken so oft berühren schienen. Dürer war groß und schlank, lieblich und majestätisch fielen seine lockigen Haare um seine Schläfe, sein Gesicht war ehrwürdig und doch freundlich, seine Mienen veränderten den Ausdruck nur langsam und seine schönen braunen Augen sahen feurig und doch sanft unter seiner Stirn hervor. Franz bemerkte deutlich, wie die Umrisse von Alberts Gesichte denen auffallend glichen, mit denen man immer den Erlöser der Welt zu malen pflegt. Lukas erschien neben Albert noch kleiner, als er wirklich war; sein Gesicht veränderte sich in jedem Augenblicke, seine Augen waren mehr lebhaft als ausdrucksvoll, sein hellbraunes Haar lag schlicht und kurz um seinen Kopf" (105-06).

This instance of an uncritical adherence to the precepts of physiognomy in Tieck's *Sternbald* is flanked by texts that take a more reflective stance to Lavater and the power of bearing certain looks that affirm certain identities. Both Goethe's *Werther*, which precedes, and E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Kater Murr*, which follows *Sternbald*, show much more critical responses to this discipline for analyzing a person's nature and asserting a particular social order.

Goethe's *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers* (*The Sorrows of Young Werther*, 1774) makes several allusions to the person of Lavater and to the practices of physiognomy. The text twice makes reference to Lavater's work, not as a physiognomist but as a pastor. On one occasion a footnote draws attention to Lavater's sermon on ill-humor (36). The Swiss clergyman is directly cited as if his high moral standing were to have the effect of further implicating and so confirming the new wife of the minister in her foolishness. When commenting on her responsibility for the felling of the walnut trees, under which Werther had sat with Lotte, and which had been planted by clergymen and were cherished by the schoolmaster, Werther describes the woman as a "scraggy, sickly brute ... An ugly creature [a fool] who puts forth pretensions to learning ... and shrugs her shoulders at the enthusiasms of Lavater" (67).[8] Werther draws a comparison to physiognomical measurements when agreeing with his correspondent, Wilhelm, that he should come to a decision concerning his affections for Lotte. He remarks that "In this world it is rarely possible to settle matters with an 'either, or' since there are as many gradations of emotion and conduct as there are stages between a hooked nose and one that turns up" (35).[9] He also cuts out a silhouette of Lotte, which he hangs onto after she has married Albert.[10]

---

[6] "[Franz] konnte sein Auge von dem Jünglinge gar nicht zurückziehn, die lustigen, hellen, braunen Augen und das gelockte Haar, eine freie Stirn und dazu eine bunte, fremdartige Tracht machten ihn zum Gegenstande von Franzens Neugier" (136).

[7] "[D]enn Franz war jetzt in der blühendsten Periode seines Lebens, sein Ansehn war munter, sein Auge feurig, seine Wangen rot, sein Schritt und Gang edel, beinahe stolz. Er hatte die Demut und Schüchternheit fast ganz abgelegt, die ihn bis dahin immer noch als einen Fremden kennbar machte. Er geriet nun nicht mehr so wie sonst in Verlegenheit, wenn ein Maler seine Arbeiten lobte, weil er sich auch daran mehr gewöhnt hatte" (376).

Most of the novel is framed between two encounters that are initially physiognomical in nature and that appear to subscribe to this classifying system as a means of acknowledging or looking favorably on intellectuals. Toward the beginning of the work Werther reports that "A few days ago I met a young man named V., a straightforward youth with very pleasing features. He has just come down from the University, does not exactly consider himself a sage but yet thinks he knows more than others do" (8).[11] Again, toward the final part of the work Werther encounters "an apparition," a man called Heinrich who is emotionally disturbed, and who bears "a very interesting physiognomy of which the chief feature was a quiet melancholy, but which otherwise expressed a good and frank disposition" (73, 74).[12] These two scenes relate to Werther almost identically on two complementary levels. On the one level, the two men very much resemble Werther for not only are they both relative reflections of Werther's personal condition at the time – the first "thinks he knows more than others," the second is suffering from depression caused by an unrequited love – but they are also, significantly, both educated men – the first is clearly an academic, the second, we are informed, once "wrote a good hand" and thereby earned his living (75).[13] However, on a second level, as educated men who *do*, in their nature, resemble Werther, and who *are* indeed then described by Werther, playing the casual physiognomist, and in favorable terms – the first has "very pleasing features," the second "a good and frank disposition" in spite of his sorrows – they are figures who distinguish a relation of sameness with Werther. Thus, in considering others, Werther is considering none other than himself; he is casting a sympathetic light on his own type and in so doing enables the symbolic acknowledgment of his own standing as an educated man.

---

[8] All English translations of Goethe's work are taken from a version by William Rose (page references to which will appear in the text) and are followed by footnotes containing the original; here: "ein hageres kränkliches Geschöpf ... Eine Närrin, die sich abgibt, gelehrt zu sein ... und über Lavaters Schwärmereien die Achseln zuckt" (95).

[9] "in der Welt ist es sehr selten mit dem Entweder-Oder getan; die Empfindungen und Handlungsweisen schattieren sich so mannigfaltig, als Abfälle zwischen einer Habichts- und Stumpfnase sind" (48).

[10] "I have begun Lotte's portrait three times, and each time I have made a mess of it, which vexes me all the more since I got it quite successfully some time ago. Then I cut out her silhouette, and that will have to suffice" (33); "Lottens Porträt habe ich dreimal angefangen und habe mich dreimal prostituiert; das mich um so mehr verdrießt, weil ich vor einiger Zeit sehr glücklich im Treffen war. Darauf habe ich denn ihren Schattenriß gemacht und damit soll mir genügen" (45). "I was awaiting news when your wedding day was to be, and had intended on that day solemnly to take down Lotte's silhouette from the wall and bury it under other papers. Now you are married, and her portrait is still here! Well, it shall stay!" (57-58); "ich wartete auf Nachricht, wann Euer Hochzeitstag sein würde, und hatte mir vorgenommen, feierlichst an demselben Lottens Schattenriß von der Wand zu nehmen und ihn unter andere Papiere zu begraben. Nun seid Ihr ein Paar, und ihr Bild ist noch hier! Nun, so soll es bleiben!" (78). Surely these two scenes refer to Pliny's story of a Corinthian maid who takes a silhouette of her lover as a reminder of their union and symbol of its unattainability once they are apart. I find it intriguing that Werther is feminized by his relation to the story. Goethe fell in love with Charlotte von Stein before they met by being shown her silhouette (Bräuning-Oktavio 6-7; Hickman 38; Kroeber 14; Tytler 57).

However, if Goethe is complicitous in this way with his Werther-novel with the apparent utility of the physiognomical tendency of procuring intellectual authority over the faces of others in order to assert one's own identity, then he is also as committed to revealing problems with this system. For example, Werther hierarchizes Albert, Lotte's fiancé, above himself, and he does this in a physiognomical manner: "His outward calm is in very vivid contrast to the restlessness of my character, which I am unable to conceal ... He appears rarely to be in an ill-humor" (34).[14] The first dilemma for the physiognomic system that supposedly assists the symbolic power of the intellectual is that it is inoperative in the face of the 'power of love.'

---

[11] "Vor wenig Tagen traf ich einen jungen V ... an, einen offnen Jungen, mit einer gar glücklichen Gesichtsbildung. Er kommt erst von Akademien, dünkt sich eben nicht weise, aber glaubt doch, er wisse mehr als andere" (11).

[12] "eine Erscheinung"; "eine gar interessante Physiognomie, darin eine stille Trauer den Hauptzug machte, die aber sonst nichts als einen geraden guten Sinn ausdrückte" (104).

[13] "seine schöne Hand schrieb" (105).

The second difficulty that Goethe appears to indicate concerns class. In the letter of December 24, 1771, Werther complains about his horrible – "garstig" (72) – immediate social circle and the issue of their love of rank. He describes his immediate superior, the ambassador, as a "meticulous fool ... as fussy as an old woman" and feels personally insulted when the latter criticizes his friend Graf von C. as "lacking in solid erudition, like all literary folk" (53).[15] Just previously, Werther had described the Graf as "einen weiten großen Kopf" (70) – which can be understood at once figuratively and literally: a broad and great mind / a broad and great head. Werther also describes his acquaintance with Fräulein von B. – "a charming creature, who has preserved considerable naturalness in spite of the stiff conventional life here" (54) – who is staying with her aunt "an old maid whose physiognomy was displeasing to me" and who, as the younger woman later confirmed, has "neither a respectable fortune *nor qualities of mind*, has no support in her old age other than her ancestral tree, no protection other than the rank behind which she barricades herself, and no pleasure except to look down from her height and ignore the middle classes" (55; my emphasis).[16] It appears that the degree of grandeur or charm exhibited by one's physiognomy is confirmation of the extent to which one's natural intellect has been able to overcome the stifling prohibitions of convention and rank.

Yet in the letter of March 15, 1772, we learn that Werther prolongs an invitation to dine at Graf von C.'s to join a gathering of members of the aristocracy. Again, the physiognomical description of the party is a performative technique that draws attention to their philistinism. It is to the point in its lack of compliment: "Then there enters the more-than-gracious Madame von S. with her consort and her nobly hatched little goose of a flat-chested, tight-laced daughter. They widen their eyes and nostrils in the traditional, highly-aristocratic manner *en passant*" (58).[17] Since the description of outward demeanor necessarily expresses the relation to the physiognomist, a part played here by Werther, then the typing of certain members of the nobility as pompous and vacuous dimwits at the same time seems to underline and promote Werther's intellectual authority and symbolic rise through the ranks – especially since he explains "an evil genius held me back" after dinner with the Graf (59).[18] However, in this company, Fräulein von B. is embarrassed to talk with Werther, and the Graf politely asks him to leave. The rebuff is soon picked up by Werther's opponents who jubilantly exclaim, "that one could see what happened to arrogant fellows who boasted of their modicum of intellect and thought it gave them a right to set themselves above all conventions" (60).[19] Werther may well have found a symbolic outlet to assert his intellectual superiority, but this by no means has translated into political power.

---

[14] "Seine gelassene Außenseite sticht gegen die Unruhe meines Charakters sehr lebhaft ab, die ich nicht verbergen lässt ... Er scheint mir wenig üble Laune zu haben" (47).

[15] "der pünktlichste Narr ... und umständlich wie eine Base" (71); "an gründlicher Gelehrsamkeit mangle es ihm wie allen Belletristen" (71-72).

[16] "ein liebenswürdiges Geschöpf, das sehr viele Natur mitten in dem steifen Leben erhalten hat"; "Die Physiognomie der Alten gefiel mir nicht"; "kein anständiges Vermögen, keinen Geist und keine Stütze hat als die Reihe ihrer Vorfahren, keinen Schirm als den Stand, in den sie sich verpalisadiert, und kein Ergetzen, als von ihrem Stockwerk herab über die bürgerlichen Häupter wegzusehen" (73).

Goethe shows that the symbolic power supposedly accrued from physiognomical discourse is again made null and void, this time, when it carries with it no sociopolitical power. Whereas *Sternbald* occasioned a simple borrowing of the physiognomical legitimation of artists' rank, Goethe's *Werther* shows a critical dialogue with aspects of physiognomy. Without rejecting the practice entirely, the work draws attention to certain difficulties. Any impact made by the assertion of good looks will certainly be qualified once the factors of politics and love are taken into account. Goethe appears to be paying basic homage to Lavater's system, but at the same time he augments it by pointing out the complex criteria that necessarily regulate and limit its effectiveness.

---

[17] "Da tritt herein die übergnädige Dame von S ... mit ihrem Herrn Gemahle und wohl ausgebrüteten Gänslein Tochter, mit der flachen Brust und niedlichem Schnürleibe, machen en passant ihre hergebrachten hochadligen Augen und Naslöcher" (79).

[18] "ein böser Genius hat mich zurückgehalten" (80).

[19] "da sähe man's, wo es mit den Übermütigen hinausginge, die sich ihres bißchen Kopfs überhöben und glaubten, sich darum über alle Verhältnisse hinaussetzen zu dürfen" (80).

Hoffmann's *Lebens-Ansichten des Katers Murr* (*The Life and Opinions of Kater Murr / The Educated Cat*, 1820/22) again draws attention to the problematic relation between artist-figures and the classifications of physiognomy. Hoffmann's novel demonstrates a fundamental difference between early romanticism – as exemplified by *Sternbald* – and late romanticism in its tendency to ironize the ideal of the artist. Murr, who is the very bestial embodiment of philistinism, appears to risk upsetting all order by pursuing a Wilhelm-Meister-like formation of a genius in the body of a cat. Yet as he dreams of an academic career, the dogs debate that only certain people may succeed intellectually since only certain creatures look the part: "Is it not clearly stated in ancient academic statutes that, in case misuse get out of hand, no ass should ever become the chair of a university. And does this decree not also pertain to animals of each and every kind and species, and therefore also to cats."[20] Thus, the important position attributed to the artist or intellectual is not so much questioned as the efficacy of the means available for securing that position and the exclusive right of entry of particular species, that is, of people of a certain race, ethnicity, or even gender.

The episodes in *Kater Murr* that allude to physiognomical practices or dwell on the meaning of faces tend to mock the phenomenon, pointing out that artists have made playful use of it or that it can be commandeered to achieve ends other than that for which it was perhaps originally intended. For example, an ironic and *literal* spin is put on the physiognomical aim of distinguishing between genuine artists and overzealous pretenders. Meister Abraham cuts out paper silhouettes of strange figures in order to shoo away a "young and enthusiastic lieutenant with red cheeks and very curly hair on his head" who had been reading Kreisler "the long and even more boring first act of an appalling tragedy ... with all the pretension of the happiest of poets."[21] Later, Abraham adds a choir of nuns and the image of Kreisler's uncle Ottfried Wenzel to his repertoire of shadowy figures as accompaniment to Kreisler's account of his childhood.

---

[20] "Steht es denn nicht deutlich in den uralten akademischen Statuten, daß, überhandgenommenen Mißbrauchs halber, keine Esel mehr zur Professur gelangen sollen, und ist diese Verordnung nicht auch auf Tiere auszudehnen von jeder Art und Gattung, mithin auch auf Kater" (157).

This episode concerning young Kreisler's career options makes use of the performance of outward appearance to emphasize the disparity between the determination of identity and one's actual role or calling in life. Although art was his life and soul – "that which filled my soul, which was my real ambition, the one and true calling in my life"[22] – the boy Kreisler at one point wanted to be and look like his guardian uncle's younger brother who had left the musical family to become a much respected counsellor to a legation ("Geheimer Legationsrat" 106): "The venerable uncle's picture hung in the salon and I entertained no greater desire than to go around with the same hairdo and the same clothes as the uncle in the picture. My guardian granted me this wish and, as a ten-year-old, I must have looked really quite charming in a toupée as high as the sky and with a small circular draw-string pouch for my hair, a siskin-green coat with narrow silver embroidery, silk stockings, and a little dagger."[23] It appears, then, that artist-figures can be just as adept at performing other airs and graces no matter how absurd or apparently incongruous to their innate nature.

The boy Kreisler's two opposing descriptions of Herr Liscov (a.k.a. Meister Abraham) expose both the arbitrariness in determining the image of the artist-figure and the inevitable extent to which assumptions distort one's perspective. Hoffmann indicates that an artist-figure is not so easily classifiable after all. Because of Liscov's "foolish notions and wild ideas" that keep him apart from other people, the young Kreisler imagines the musician to strike “a very peculiar figure.”[24] But after hearing the church organ he had repaired, another image takes its place in the boy’s mind: “In the boy’s opinion, Herr Liscov must be a large, handsome man with an imposing appearance, must speak clearly and boldly and, above all, must wear a plum-colored coat with wide gold braid, like the godfather businessman who goes around dressed in such a manner, and for whose opulent costume little Johannes feels the deepest respect.”[25] However, we are told that one day “a small, lean man came dashing up the street in an ankle-length roquelaure coat made of a heavy woollen weave and whose open sleeve straps flapped strangely up and down in the wind. In addition, he had stuck a small triangular hat warlike on top of his white-powdered hairdo and a pigtail – which was too long – wriggled down his back ... when the man came past the window he shot a piercing look with his sparkling, jet-black [pechschwarzen] eyes at my uncle.”[26] The boy Kreisler learns that this man was Liscov and the narrator cannot help but muse: “strangely, indeed, miraculously enough, it so happened that Herr Liscov looked completely and utterly as the boy had imagined him earlier.”[27]

---

[21] "ein junger hoffnungsvoller Lieutenant mit roten Wangen und wohlgekräuseltem Haupthaar"; "den langen und noch langweiligern ersten Akt eines entsetzlichen Trauerspiels ... mit aller Prätension des glücklichsten Dichters" (89).

[22] "welche mein Inneres erfüllte, mein eigentliches Streben, die wahre einzige Tendenz meines Lebens sein dürfe" (107).

[23] "Das Bildnis des vornehmen Oheims hing in dem Prunkzimmer, und keinen größern Wunsch hegte ich, als so frisiert, so gekleidet umherzugehen, wie der Oheim auf dem Bilde. Diesen Wunsch gewährte mein Erzieher, und ich muß wirklich, als zehnjähriger Knabe, anmutig genug ausgesehen haben, im himmelhoch frisierten Toupet, und kleinen zirkelrunden Haarbeutel, im zeisiggrünen Rock mit schmaler silberner Stickerei, seidenen Strümpfen und kleinem Degen" (107).

Hence artist-figures do not escape classification, rather it is emphasized that they are classified according to the beholder’s perspective at a given moment. And this perspective may change or even be contrary to the ascendant attitude of the artist. Indeed, the same face can be read in radically different ways. For instance, Kreisler, is viewed on the one hand as a genius and on the other as a dangerous madman. Lady Councillor Benzon tells Kreisler that

---

[24] “tollen Grillen, seine ausgelassenen Einfälle”; “ein ganz bestimmtes Bild” (118).

[25] “Herr Liscov mußte nach des Knaben Meinung ein großer schöner Mann sein, von stattlichem Ansehen, hell und stark sprechen, und vor allen Dingen einen pflaumfarbnen Rock tragen, mit breiten goldnen Tressen, wie der Pate Kommerzienrat, der so gekleidet ging, und vor dessen reicher Tracht der kleine Johannes den tiefsten Respekt hegte” (118).

[26] “Als eines Tages der Oheim mit Johannes am offnen Fenster stand, kam ein kleiner hagerer Mann die Straße herabgeschossen, in einem Roquelaur von hellgrünem Berkan, dessen offne Ärmelklappen seltsam im Winde auf und nieder flatterten. Dazu hatte er ein kleines dreieckiges Hütchen martialisch auf die weißgepuderte Frisur gedrückt, und ein zu langer Haarzopf schlängelte sich herab über den Rücken ... Als der Mann vor dem Fenster vorbeikam, warf er aus seinen funkelnden pechschwarzen Augen dem Oheim einen stechenden Blick zu” (118-19).

[27] “seltsam, ja, wunderbar genug begab es sich aber, daß Herr Liscov ganz genau so aussah, wie der Knabe sich ihn früher gedacht hatte” (119).

Princess Hedwiga thought he was mad on meeting him for the first time in the gardens,[28] whereas her own daughter Julia compared him to the Shakespearean character of Jacques and recognized in him "the sublime musician and composer," "a charmingly peculiar and musical ghost."[29] Later, Hedwiga explains that Kreisler reminds her of the former court artist Leonhard Ettlinger who had once tried to strangle her, that they look alike as if they were brothers. Following this, Kreisler sees Ettlinger's face as his own reflection in a lake (171). And later still, the abbot of the benedictine monastery where Kreisler has gone into hiding also mentions Ettlinger. The physiognomical prescription of the resemblance to Ettlinger that pursues Kreisler shows signs of having an oppressive effect on the artist-figure: "It seemed to him as if a strange, ghostly force wanted to penetrate his soul with violence and to rob him of his freedom of thought."[30] Indeed, physiognomical discourse can be used against the artist-figure as in this instance, since the abbot is in league with Benzon who wants Kreisler out of the way so that her daughter Julia will marry into royalty. Again, love and politics seem to intercept the physiognomical system that is supposedly designed to assert the privilege of artists impressing upon it to counteract any symbolic assertion with that image that best corroborates the standpoint of the more politically powerful beholder.

These episodes demonstrate that Hoffmann appropriates motives from and the general principles of physiognomy in order to show how their use is both arbitrary and deceptive. The celebrated physiognomical system of physically recognizing and symbolically acknowledging the artistic genius is perhaps most ironized in Hoffmann's novel by the fact that the physiognomical observations are made by people other than the artistic hero and, in fact, may easily be used by others against artist-intellectuals. Though obviously sympathetic to the class of artists, Hoffmann raises the issue of the inevitable problems with classifying according to the face.

---

[28] That face-to-face encounter is described at the time in the following manner: "[Kreisler] had begun to talk at the same time as the princess, turned to her quickly, and looked her in the eye, but his entire face appeared to have changed. – Gone for ever was the expression of melancholy yearning, gone for ever was any sign of a disposition aroused deep in the soul, and a mad, contorted smile intensified the expression of bitter irony until it appeared comical or droll"; "[Kreisler] hatte sich, sowie die Prinzessin [Hedwiga] zu sprechen begann, rasch zu ihr gewendet, und schaute ihr jetzt in die Augen, aber sein ganzes Antlitz schien ein andres worden. – Vertilgt war der Ausdruck schwermütiger Sehnsucht, vertilgt jede Spur des tief im Innersten aufgeregten Gemüts, ein toll verzerrtes Lächeln steigerte den Ausdruck bitterer Ironie bis zum Possierlichen, bis zum Skurrilen" (59).

[29] "den sublimen Musiker und Komponisten"; "ein anmutig wunderlicher, musikalischer Spuk" (72).

[30] "Es war ihm als wolle eine fremde geistige Macht gewaltsam in sein Inneres dringen und ihm die Freiheit des Gedankens rauben" (302).

Several of the figures that appear in Eduard Mörike's novel / novella *Maler Nolten* (*Nolten the Painter*, 1832) query the very grounds of representation. The work centers around the construction of the ideal artist in the person of Theobald Nolten. Essentially, Nolten has the right face – “a promising and remarkably pleasant physiognomy”[31] – but it is the handiwork and conniving particularly of his one-time servant Wispel and the actor Larkens that establish his reputation. Nolten describes Wispel as “a milksop, and barber by profession” who “aside from a ... universally enthusiastic stroke of the blade, aside from a coiffeur's arrogance, always demonstrated a certain good-naturedness that eventually was only able to give way to the most obstinate vanity.”[32] Later we learn that Wispel is “mincing” and that he lisps “with recondite preciosity.”[33] He impersonates an Italian artist and also slips into French at whim. Recent criticism by Isabel Horstmann has pointed out how Mörike takes up the controversy surrounding the physiognomy debate between Lavater and Lichtenberg in his portrayal of an “African” character Margot (Horstmann 146-53; see also Tscherpel 39). But no-one has as yet fully divulged the figure of Wispel in this regard (cf. Tscherpel) or why, for that matter, Mörike's work revolves around the assumption that Nolten's face is the only one acceptable as a representation of an artist. He is the only one with the external appearance necessary for ‘naturally’ asserting the symbolic power of artists. But what is expressed by Larkens's or Wispel's face that makes either inadequate or undesirable as such a representation? What is it about these two characters that requires them to use the more suitable face of another in their bid to command symbolic authority? I would suggest that the aesthetes Wispel and Larkens both represent queer faces and their demise is an indication of – perhaps Mörike's desire to show – how impossible it is, under a patriarchal, masculinist hegemony, to define the artist in any terms other than the Biedermeier, bourgeois, heterosexual 'ideal,' should one intend the social success and symbolic authority of the artist. Mörike's work qualifies the physiognomical system that affirms the artist's privilege in that it points out the insufficiency of merely displaying artistic affectations. For symbolic power adheres to the criteria of social power. Thus, an artist is acknowledged and earns his place only if he does not defy certain other identity-functions, such as the sociosexual conditions for membership in the hegemony.

---

[31] “eine sehr vielversprechende und auffallend angenehme Gesichtsbildung” (20).

[32] “einen Hasenfuß, Barbier seiner Profession”; “neben einem ... universal-enthusiastischen Hieb, neben einem badermäßigen Hochmut, immer eine gewisse Gutmütigkeit zeigte, die in der Folge nur der borniertesten Eitelkeit weichen konnte” (22).

[33] “zimpferlich” (352); “mit geheimnisvoller Preziosität” (353).

The face in the novel of the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century is an integral part of negotiating or confirming the privileged position in society allotted to the artist. In *Sternbald*, *Werther*, and even *Murr*, social function predicts appearance, and an artist or intellectual's appearance is one that may transgress other social hierarchies. However, these novels generally reflect upon the face in a fashion that does more than simply reiterate the self-validating work begun by physiognomists on behalf of intellectuals. At least two of them tend to query the efficacy, veracity, and reliability of such a strategy of asserting and, therefore, determining for oneself a certain honored or influential position in society. Though they are aware of difficulties, none entirely undermines the basic premise. Only *Nolten* subverts the system by indicating that the bourgeois social hegemony can make an artist in its own image thus affirming its own authority over artist-intellectuals and, consequently, the politicocultural superiority of the bourgeoisie.

In the next four chapters I shall extend my initial look at the presence of physiognomy in select German-language prose from the time of and immediately following Lavater's *Fragments* to analyze four works representing a period that spans almost one hundred years from the early 1800s to the early 1900s. The above survey has already shown how literary works become a venue for the conveyance of physiognomy and, thus, also for the discussion of that practice as a technology designed at this time specifically to determine 'genuine' artist types, their cultural authority over the face, and ultimately their sociosymbolic superiority as cultural producers. I have also noted that, while replaying physiognomy's aggrandizement of the symbolic power and exclusive position of the artist-intellectual, the literary work often shows such self-promotion to be an effect of, a response to, or even compromised by the economy of normative love and desire, the sociopolitical realities of the class system and dominant attitudes toward race and gender, and the arbitrary way in which any appearance can be made to match up with any function and therefore any character. In fact, the usefulness of the physiognomical determination of cultural producers is so governed by the opportunism of description, classification, and perspective, that it can be used just as easily against an artist and the field of art as for them. To continue my inquiry into the relation between physiognomy and the position of the artist-figure in culture and society, I shall examine Adelbert von Chamisso's *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte* (*Peter Schlemihl's Strange Story*, 1814), (again) Eduard Mörike's *Maler Nolten* (*Nolten the Painter*, 1832), Adalbert Stifter's *Der Nachsommer* (*Indian Summer*, 1857), and Thomas Mann's *Der Tod in Venedig* (*Death in Venice*, 1912). I have chosen these texts not because they explicitly single out physiognomy as a guiding set of principles or a broad and self-conscious social phenomenon by which one should live one's life – as do, say, Karl Philipp August Moritz in a cautionary fashion in *Anton Reiser* (1782-85) and Musäus and Johann Christian Müller satirically in *Physiognomische Reisen* (*Physiognomical Journeys*, 1778-79) and *Fragmente aus dem Leben und Wandel eines Physiognomisten* (*Fragments from the Life and Travels of a Physiognomist*, 1790), respectively. Rather, I refer to these works because each in turn casually draws attention to and treats the discourse of the face as an admittedly pervasive, yet subtle, means of constructing the physically recognizable and socially recognized artist-intellectual in a manner that concerns less the system's faddishness, efficacy, or foolhardiness than the artist-intellectual's complicity with and dependency on that system. Each of the four novels I have selected for further inquiry reflects some degree of familiarity with Lavater's thought and practice and, thus, an adherence to – what I deem – the cuspal classical episteme controlling the possibility of physiognomical knowledge. However, just as Lavater's work marks a shift in the thought structure of physiognomical discourse, so do the four chosen literary texts reveal both a constant debt to the composite images of superficial structures and tabular classifications comprising Lavater's work and a gradual epistemological move toward modernity's requirements of a relation external to the character-face/sign as the basis of order, its interest less in individual moral character than in cultural-historical distinctions, and thus its concern less with taxonomy and typology than with series and topology. Finally, and most importantly, by evoking physiognomical discourse as a means by which artist-intellectuals are defined and do define themselves, *Schlemihl*, *Nolten*, *Nachsommer*, and *Death in Venice* – whose protagonists are all cultural types – necessarily document artist-intellectuals' attempts to manage faces and the identity-functions that form the grounds of their representation – that is, assumptions of desire, class affiliation, race, gender, and mental aptitude – in order to make a system designed to aid their recognition, success, and privilege thus actually work as best it can for them both as cultural types and as individuals. Indeed, the four prose works under consideration make a point of how the regulation of ('nonartistic') others always constitutively connotes the regulation of the ('artistic') self and, thus, how artist-intellectuals are at the mercy of a system that would promote their interests. Thus the next four chapters will focus on the rise or fall of cultural types, their access to celebrity and power, not from the perspective of their contribution to culture, but from the perspective of their ability to regulate themselves by means of the physiognomical regulation of others.

Chapter One

"Aus dem Gesicht verloren": The Physiognomical Shade and Chamisso's *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte*

This chapter discusses the effect of the knowledge of physiognomy as it informs the fate and interpersonal relations of the protagonist of Adelbert von Chamisso's novel *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte* (*Peter Schlemihl's Strange Story*, 1814). Chamisso's captivating short prose work of romantic or fantastic realism is commonly understood as a personal criticism of the paradigms of social acceptance, of the way one part of society excludes those it sees as different. It traces Schlemihl's attempts to achieve social success and recognition in several spheres of life. At various moments, he mingles with the moneyed classes or appears to be an aristocrat or an intellectual, as well as being a traveler, a man on the street, an employer, or a groom, and, finally, he is someone who bargains with other men. But when Schlemihl loses possession, first, of his letter of reference and, then, of his shadow, it is shown just how difficult or impossible acceptance can be without the ready material components that give shape to a person's identity. The combined elements of the image conveyed by the shadow and the defining words contained in a letter of reference, which are essential both to Schlemihl's story and to the format of physiognomy, thus, by their loss, signal Chamisso's work as a commentary on the conventions of social hierarchy whereby a good appearance confers a definition of acceptability and success upon some, while others whose appearances are less favorable are singled out as socially less significant or even as undesirables.

Chamisso's novel is thus a document of the reception of physiognomy since the early *Goethezeit* as a theory that uses the representations of the face to acquire knowledge of an individual's place in society. Indeed, from the appearance of Johann Caspar Lavater's famous *Physiognomical Fragments* from 1775 to 1778 to the publication of *Peter Schlemihl* in 1814 and well beyond, the features of the face, as they reappear in learned and popular discourses of physiognomy, are heralded as the naturally occurring qualitative predeterminers of an individual's worth and position in the overall structure of society. The face purportedly embodies the secrets to the individual's soul and standing that only the key of physiognomical knowledge can unlock. I believe that Chamisso proffers an investigation of one unlucky man who, in spite of his ambition and creative talent, is caught up in or caught out by this modern mechanism of social destiny for the very same reasons of regulating otherness that caused its inception in the first place. In the case of Chamisso's Schlemihl, I see an antagonism between intellectual potential and sexual difference to be at the root of his social exclusion and physiognomical crisis of identity. An approach that draws out the story's inherent links to one of the most prevalent sociocultural discourses of identity-formation of the day will provide some clarification in the ongoing debate in secondary literature concerning the meaning of Schlemihl's lost shadow from a perspective that has as yet been largely untreated.[1] A study of the divergence between the shadow and shadowlessness in light of the knowledge of physiognomy will also demonstrate for the first time the writer's critical response to the pervasive presuppositions imposed by this cultural phenomenon particularly upon those wishing to participate in the world of creative and scholarly pursuits. Finally, it will reveal one literary character's eventual resolve not to succumb to a confining social apparatus and repressive public attitudes. I will thus enlarge upon reflections on the story's theme of the outsider as it relates to the issue of the author's consideration of his own probable homosexuality.

A critical and skeptical reading of the works of physiognomists inevitably reveals that the order of human nature alleged by these pseudoscientists and soothsayers is ultimately the effect of the attachment of an arbitrary selection of faces and facial features to the preconceived – and perhaps prejudiced – functions of identity. Once an individual's face has been transcribed as a sketch, outline, silhouette, or written assessment for the purposes of physiognomy, instead of gaining insight into the object of study, as a physiognomist would have it, one actually almost completely loses sight of the individual. The genuine face is lost to a transposed form, an artificial representation in image or word and a source of knowledge that can have less to do with the individual under observation than with the aims of the observer, the physiognomist, and that part of culture to which the physiognomist belongs and for whose purposes the individual's face is being put to use. For instance, the section on national physiognomy in Lavater's *Fragments*, though purporting to reveal national characteristics by an appreciation of features supposedly common to certain ethnic groups, really manages to betray only what in late-eighteenth-century Swiss and German society was the commonly perceived social function or collective contribution of different peoples. The joviality of a Pole and the humility and diligence of a Dutchman that Lavater accords to their respective features seem evidence enough for him to demonstrate the former's vocation as a cattle farmer and the latter's propensity for heroic and philosophical accomplishment (320-25). This self-serving tendency found in Lavater lives on today. In *The Face of Desire*, Eric Clay Ong adapts revelations from the "Asian science of face reading" to determine a man's erotic personality and sexual preferences from his physical features. But considering the accompanying photo of a handsome, chiseled blond, Ong's conclusions are surely the product of the limited iconography of late-twentieth-century gay America, a supposedly ethnically integrated culture that is in all actuality still largely aestheticopolitically dominated by the standard of the masculine descendants of white-skinned European settlers and immigrants.

---

[1] Only Weissberg and Stoichita make a connection between physiognomy and Chamisso's work. Weissberg regards the separation of the shadow from the body as Chamisso's attempt to question the relation between the sign and the designated object (309). In his *Short History of the Shadow*, Stoichita discusses in succession Lavater's use of the shadow in physiognomy and Chamisso's consideration of "the *interpretable* nature of the barter of the shadow" (170), but connects the two only insofar as they are both concerned with the representations of man (184). Stoichita's main interest rests in George Cruikshank's, Adolf Schrödter's, and Adolf Menzel's illustrative interpretations (see Ch. 5, esp. 168-85). One English translation is accompanied by illustrations also by Forster Robson (see Rappoport).

The cultural bias of the physiognomist is evident even in the literary reception of Chamisso's novel. Josef Nadler, who is often cited for maintaining that Schlemihl's shadow stands for "ethnicity, belief, family, rank, class, relation, reputation, and name,"[2] draws on popular physiognomical knowledge when concluding his assessment of Chamisso and his work. Nadler remarks that "Chamisso's head, framed by long, wavy hair – his sharp face with its bold and slightly curved nose and its suggestion of the Habsburg lips – reveals an unmistakably Germanic character."[3] This description of the very Germanic national aspect of Chamisso's outward appearance is followed by a brief account of the French-born author's manner and mannerisms that may be divided evenly between respective Germanic and Gallic sides. Nadler is thus able to explain the story of Schlemihl as the effect of the national and cultural discrepancies in the author's life without relinquishing his (Nadler's) claim on the work as part of the cultural heritage of specifically German romanticism. In spite of the behavioral discrepancies, Nadler's description of Chamisso's face leaves no doubt as to the author's identity as German. Thomas Mann also briefly describes Chamisso's appearance while appraising his story of Schlemihl: "He was a tall, gentle person with long, flowing, smooth hair and noble, almost beautiful facial features."[4] I believe Mann's emphasis on Chamisso's good looks may be just one component of an entire rhetorical system on Mann's part that identifies Chamisso as a man who is erotically inclined toward members of his own sex (a point I shall discuss further below). Clearly, for two critics at least, the cultural relevance of an author and his work is contained in the identity-function apparently performed by the author's meaningful face.[5]

---

[2] "Volkstum, Bekenntnis, Familie, Rang, Stand, Beziehung, Ruf und Name" (122).

When the very means by which an individual's face may be attached to a particular identity-function is lost or taken away, then that face or individual falls outside of the established discourse of human nature. They are no longer familiar like the appealing genius or the despicable villain, but problematically unfamiliar, unknown, and unsettling. This is the case with Chamisso's Schlemihl when his letter of reference is taken away and he exchanges his shadow for money. Though his finances have become inexhaustible,

---

[3] "Chamissos Kopf, von gewelltem, langem Haar umwallt, das scharfe Gesicht mit der kühnen, leichtgebogenen Nase und der angedeuteten Habsburgerlippe, unverkennbar germanisches Gepräge [zeigt]" (124).

[4] "Er war ein hochgewachsener, sanfter Mensch mit lang herabhängendem, glattem Haar und edlen, beinahe schönen Gesichtszügen" ("Chamisso" 523-24).

[5] A passing interest in Chamisso's looks reoccurs in more recent times. Curiously, Adnes draws attention to the feminine aspect of the author's face: "Portraits, paintings, or drawings introduce us to his beautiful face: *a little feminine*, with fine and regular features, abundant, well-parted hair falling in curls to his shoulders" (my emphasis); "Les portraits, peintures ou dessins, nous font connaître son beau visage, un peu féminin, aux traits réguliers et fins, aux cheveux abondants bien partagés et tombant en boucles jusqu'aux épaules" (146).

Schlemihl's social and cultural aspirations as a wealthy bourgeois or aristocrat, a lauded artist-intellectual, and the most eligible bachelor in north German society cannot be sustained since he now lacks adequate supportive physiognomical reference material. Subsequently, Schlemihl – without the means by which he would be classified – faces the problem of being seen as a problem by the rest of society. But this does not mean that Schlemihl or any other shadowless or physiognomically challenged individual is necessarily entirely without identity. Rather, with Schlemihl losing only his shadow and not his face, it comes to light that the identity otherwise inertly and directly associated with Schlemihl by way of his face is simply a different one than the one that formal physiognomy had maintained by way of the shadow (or that referees convey in a letter). Admittedly, by dint of the fact that it lacks the documentary evidence of physiognomy, this *residual* identity may be more difficult to fathom, classify, or accept. Thus, in my analysis of Chamisso's novel, I aim to explore the relation between, on the one hand, an authentic or *formal* identity guaranteed particularly by the socially significant representative function of shadows (and of references) and, on the other, the harder to glean and perhaps more disturbing knowledge of the bare face. The relation of the system of shadows or the physiognomical order of human nature to the exact meaning of Schlemihl's socially inauthentic shadowlessness is exactly that of the officially recognized and readily orderable over the wholly unacknowledged and largely nonpermissible. The shadow is the material element of a cultural strategy for the regulation of the structure of society. But when exploring the nature and narrative function of Peter Schlemihl's shadow, one must also account for the face it represents and leaves behind, since the two are divergent, yet equal, witnesses to the role of physiognomy in the ordering of humanity.

At first glance, *Peter Schlemihl* hardly seems the most obvious candidate for a critical examination of the figures of literary texts from the perspective of the presence of physiognomy. And especially since Schlemihl eventually becomes a natural historian, his story again hardly seems very pertinent to the discussion of the specifications for defining the artistic intellectual by the knowledge apparently accrued from a person's face. Facial, physical, and character descriptions in Chamisso's novel are few in number, scant in detail, and, on the whole, rather generic. Fanny is merely pretty (18, 32). Mina is first known as "the lofty, tender form" ("die hohe, zarte Bildung" 35) and later is tritely "pale and beautiful like the first snow" ("bleich und schön wie der erste Schnee" 45). Her father the Forester usually has an immoveable face (45). Thomas John is recognizable by his "corpulent self-complacency" ("wohlbeleibten Selbstzufriedenheit" 17), though after his death he has a "pale, altered form" ("bleiche entstellte Gestalt" 66). And at a parish fair, "the beautiful boy with fair curly hair" ("der schöne blondlockige Knabe" 69) sells Schlemihl his magical seven-league boots. The Gray Man earns the most epithets. First, he is delineated as "A quiet, thin, gaunt, lanky, elderly man" ("Ein stiller, dünner, hagrer, länglichter, ältlicher Mann" 18), though thereafter he is generally referred to simply as "the gray man" ("der graue Mann" 19), "the man in the gray coat" ("der Mann im grauen Rock" 19, 21, 47, 54), "the gray-coated thin man" ("De[r] grau gekleidete[] dürre[] Mann" 59), "the gray fiend" ("diese[r] graue[] Unhold" 58), "the unknown" ("jene[r] Unbekannte[]" 38), "the pale" ("de[r] blasse[]" 38) or "the ugly" ("Diese[r] häßliche[]" 49) or "the mysterious sneak" ("diese[r] rätselhafte[] Schleicher" 57), "this sneering imp" ("diese[r] hohnlächelnde[] Kobold" 49), eventually "my extraordinary companion" ("Mein wundersamer Begleiter" 64), and quite possibly "a damned hunchbacked lout" ("Ein verdammter buckeliger Schlingel" 24). Schlemihl remarks upon "his pale appearance" ("seine blasse Erscheinung" 21) and, at one point, the Gray Man also makes "a very dark face" ("ein sehr finsteres Gesicht" 49). When trying to discover the Gray Man's name, Schlemihl walks up to "a young man who seemed [to him] to be of a lesser standing than the others" who then describes the Gray Man as "'That man who looks like the end of a piece of thread that has escaped a tailor's needle?'" but maintains he does not know him.[6] Schlemihl is described in the introductory letter from Chamisso to Julius Eduard Hitzig as "a long-legged youth who was considered clumsy because he was awkward, and lazy because he was lethargic" and as "an extraordinary man with a long gray beard who was wearing a very tatty black frock-coat, with a botanical container hanging at his side, and slippers over his boots in the damp, rainy weather."[7] There are also some clear, though very brief instances of physiognomical reference. The servant at the inn where Schlemihl takes a room at the beginning of the novel looks him up and down before leading him to the attic (17). Similarly, an artist throws Schlemihl's way "a penetrating look" ("einen durchbohrenden Blick" 31). The innkeeper recommends Schlemihl "a certain Bendel, whose loyal and sensible physiognomy immediately [wins him] over."[8] Certainly Schlemihl remarks that Bendel "appeared to possess skill and dexterity" ("schien Gewandtheit und Geschick zu besitzen" 27), that he was bigger and stronger than he (32), and is Argus-eyed (39). Later, on his travels, Schlemihl recognizes two Chinese "by their Asiatic physiognomy" ("an der asiatischen Gesichtsbildung" 70) and he, himself, while in the "Schlemihlium," is taken for a Jew "due to his long beard" ("seines langen Bartes wegen" 76).

---

[6] "einem jungen Mann heran, der [ihm] von minderem Ansehen schien als die andern"; "'Dieser, der wie ein Ende Zwirn aussieht, der einem Schneider aus der Nadel entlaufen ist?'" (20).

In spite of the limited magnitude of the above examples, Chamisso's novel is fundamentally concerned with the implications of a physiognomical world. The story is motivated entirely by the protagonist's sudden appearance in north German society and his separation from his shadow. It then revolves about the concomitant themes of the determination of his place in that society, his many efforts to conceal his own shadowlessness, and his attempts to retrieve his shadow before his eventual resolve to live openly without one.

In *Peter Schlemihl* and in physiognomical discourse alike, the shadow – and not the original face – is the preferred means by which *formal* identity can be explained with apparent surety. The personal crisis or alienation Schlemihl experiences is the direct consequence of his unique loss of this foremost formal marker of identity and the subsequent reliance solely on the actual face. *Peter Schlemihl* is thus primarily concerned with the care and attention given to the material necessary for the fabrication and maintenance of an official identity to be circulated in public over and above whoever or whatever an individual may in all actuality be. One of Chamisso's working titles for the novel even included the subtitle *Als Beitrag zur Lehre des Schlagschattens* ("As a Contribution to the Theory of the Sheet Shadow"; Boyd xxiii [n]) and the 1838 French edition added a tongue-in-cheek account of the physical meaning of the shadow referring to a section of René Just Haüy's *Traité élémentaire de physique* to the preface.

---

[7] "ein langbeiniger Bursch', den man ungeschickt glaubte, weil er linkisch war, und der wegen seiner Trägheit für faul galt" (3); "ein wunderlicher Mann, der einen langen, grauen Bart trug, eine ganz abgenützte schwarze Kurtka anhatte, eine botanische Kapsel darüber umgehangen, und bei dem feuchten, regnichten Wetter Pantoffeln über seine Stiefel" (4).

[8] "einen gewissen Bendel, dessen treue und verständige Physiognomie [ihn] gleich gewann" (26).

During Chamisso's lifetime, the material preferred by physiognomists for their endeavors to gain information on the intrinsic nature of a given individual happens to be the dark outline cast from the head and body as a shadow (*Schatten*).[9] To understand the reign of the shadow over the face and the not so unnatural ease with which Schlemihl's shadow can be 'taken,' it is necessary first to discuss the significance of the rediscovery of the silhouette for physiognomists. In the terms of art technology, the transcription of this shadow is referred to as a skiagram or a shade, or, more prevalently, as a silhouette (*Silhouette, Schattenriß, Scherenschnitt*). The term silhouette derived in 1759 from the name of a mid-eighteenth-century French controller-general Étienne de Silhouette whose purported hobby it was to render the shadow of the human profile in the fixed form of a two-dimensional representation cut out, drawn, or painted as a dark shape against a lighter background. (Initially, the use of the term for the flimsy cutouts was intended to ridicule the minister's frugal economic policy.) The silhouette became a source both of amusement for polite society and of income for – often itinerant – artists.[10] It was also considered an invaluable scientific resource by physiognomists. In two of his physiognomical fragments – "Ueber

---

[9] Stoichita goes too far when he maintains that "according to [Lavater], it is not ... the human face that is the reflection of the soul, but the shadow of this face" (157). Lavater certainly considers the *real* human face as an index of an individual's soul, that is, nature and standing, and only preferred shadows – along with paintings, sketches, sculptures, and skulls – for the purposes of study and taxonomy for technical, scientific, and aestheticoideological reasons that I shall explain in the following paragraphs.

[10] *The New Encyclopædia Britannica* draws attention to the numerous avid collectors of silhouettes that included Goethe and enumerates several "leading artists" who made a living from such objects: "Francis Torond, A. Charles, John Miers, C. Rosenburg, Mrs. Brown, Auguste Edouart, T. Hamlet, and Mrs. Beetham" (10: 804; see also Tytler 57-58). For the professionalization of silhouetting, see Hickman (20-51). Almost two centuries after their invention, the Hungarian-born, German-trained French artist and photographer Gilberte Brassaï reveals in a letter to his parents that he was able to eke out a living briefly by selling silhouettes while caught penniless on a sojourn in the south of France (150-51). He was also an enthusiast of physiognomy (33-34, 42) and of graphology (39-43). Chamisso and his elder brothers worked in the related craft as painters of miniatures (Koepke v).

Schattenrisse" ("On Shades") and "Wie viel man aus den Schattenrissen sehen kann?" ("Of the Great Significance of Shades") – Lavater extols the practical merits of the shadow or silhouette. He remarks, "Shades [of people or of the human face] are the weakest, most vapid, but at the same time, when the light is at a proper distance, and falls properly on the countenance to take the profile accurately, the truest representation that can be given of man" (*Essays* 187).[11] He maintains that silhouettes are more accurate than portraits (153), help to focus the observer's attention, best enable comparison between subjects (154), and lend themselves most proficiently to the task of measuring (161). He suggests the appropriate scientific terminology with which to describe the lines displayed by a silhouette: "Perpendicular; the perpendicular extended; compressed; projecting; retreating; straight lines; flexible; arched; contrasted; waving; sections of circles; of parabolas; hyperbolas; concave; convex; broken; angular; compressed; extended; opposed; homogeneous; heterogeneous; contracted" (*Essays* 192) and he divides the head into the various sections required for analysis: "1. The arching from the top of the head to the beginning of the hair. 2. The outline of the forehead to the eyebrows. 3. The space between the eyebrow and the insertion of the nose. 4. The nose to the upper lip. 5. The upper lip. 6. The lips proper. 7. The upper chin. 8. The under chin. 9. The neck. To these may be added the back of the head and the neck" (*Essays* 193).[12] For the manufacture of particularly accurate silhouettes, Lavater recommends a special device or frame attached to a chair and into which paper can be secured that would assist the artist in avoiding the "deviations" caused by the subject's fidgeting or the artist's own free hand or lack of skill (155). In 1786, Gilles-Louis Chrétien invented the physionotrace, a device used for copying silhouettes onto copper plates that are then used for mass reproduction; this was followed in 1807 by William Hyde Wollaston's invention of the camera lucida that contained a prism that assisted the drawing of objects and portraits (Baatz 13, 15).

---

[11] "Das Schattenbild von einem Menschen, oder einem menschlichen Gesichte, ist das schwächste, das leerste, aber zugleich, wenn das Licht in gehöriger Entfernung gestanden; wenn das Gesicht auf eine reine Fläche gefallen – das wahreste und getreueste Bild, das man von einem Menschen geben kann" (152).

[12] "*Perpendikulare – lockere perpendikulare, hart gespannte! So vorwärts sinkende; so zurückstrebende! gerade – weiche Linien – gebogne, gespannte, wellenförmige Sektionen von Zirkeln – von Parabolen, Hyperbolen; konkave, konvexe, gebrochne, eckigte – gepreßte, gedehnte, zusammengesetzte, homogene, heterogene – kontrastirende!*"; "1.) Den *Bogen des Scheitels* bis zum Ansatz des Haars. 2.) Den *Umriß der* Stirne bis *zur Augenbraune*. 3.) Den *Raum von der Augenbraune* bis zur *Nasenwurzel*, dem Ansatz der Nase. 4.) Die *Nase bis zur Oberlippe*. 5.) Die *Oberlippe*. 6.) Die *eigentlichen Lippen*. 7.) Das *Oberkinn*. 8.) Das *Unterkinn*. 9.) Den *Hals*. Sodann noch das *Hinterhaupt*, und den *Nacken*" (160).

Equipped with the technical vocabulary, dimensions, and instruments for securing the shadow of the head in profile, Lavater could claim with confidence that silhouettes are the proof of the objective truth of physiognomy (154). And the objectivity, that is, integrity of this truth regarding the determination of an individual's talents and character – and consequently their position and role in society by way of the knowledge of the features of their face – is substantiated by the invocation of nature and god. According to Lavater, the silhouette is "the truest, because it is the immediate expression of nature, such as not the ablest painter is capable of drawing, by hand, after nature" (*Essays* 188), and "If the shade be oracular, the voice of truth, the word of God, what must the living original be, illuminated by the spirit of God!" (*Essays* 189).[13] It stands to reason, while already considering the shadow as nature's perfect representation of itself, that Lavater should perceive the parts of the silhouette as forming the elements of a natural language that is at once truthful – "Each part of these sections [of the silhouette] is often a letter, often a syllable, often a word, often a whole discourse, proclaiming nature's truth" (*Essays* 193)[14] – since elsewhere the Swiss physiognomist and clergyman maintains that god's work appears in nature as a divine language to be read and voiced by poets (*Fragmente* 227) and that the human face, likewise, is itself the divine linguistic system with which souls communicate in heaven (*Aussichten* 1:183; cf. Siegrist; Zelle 51-53).

It is not insignificant that Lavater favors the shadowy form of the silhouette over the portrait as the foundation of physiognomical pronouncements. Consisting of "but one line," the silhouette is praised for its simplicity and its absence of confusing detail: "no motion, light, colour, height or depth; no eye, ear, nostril or cheek; but a very small part of the lip"

---

[13] "das *getreueste*, weil es ein unmittelbarer Abdruck der Natur ist, wie keiner, auch der geschickteste Zeichner, einen nach der Natur von freyer Hand zu machen im Stande ist" (152); "wenn Ein Schatten Stimme der Wahrheit, Wort Gottes ist, wie wird's das beseelte, von Gottes Licht erfüllte, lebende Urbild seyn!" (154).

[14] "Jeder einzelne Theil dieser Abschnitte [der Silhouette] ist an sich ein Buchstabe, oft eine Sylbe, oft ein Wort, oft eine ganze Rede – der Wahrheit redenden Natur" (160).

(*Essays* 188).[15] Such simplicity, incidentally, implies that it is impossible to mistake another aptitude or character for that exhibited by a silhouette; the worst one can do is see nothing at all (158). However, for all his talk of more accurate replication and the unlikelihood of misinterpretation, the silhouette provides Lavater with the ready means of disregarding the details of an animate and complex surface that otherwise indicate its classifiability, and which a sketch or painting would still try to emulate, in favor of a reduction of the human individual to a flat, monotone, dark, and particularly empty surface. Devoid of the forces of representability, the shadow becomes all the more susceptible to the implications of the physiognomist's need to make judgments and find justification for his own presuppositions: his words give shape to an identity that replaces all other distinctions. The silhouette does not equate its object, it does not reiterate the content of the object it signifies. Rather, the silhouette is a tool for erasing the distinguishing features of the human object of study and concealing it behind an arbitrary notion or type persistent in the culture of the physiognomist. Essentially, when (human) nature is seen to express itself as the visible shadow or physiognomical silhouette, the result is not exactly a purely external structure such as the face, but more an organic or internal structure (the soul?) that has been externalized, projected, or alienated. This alienated organic structure forms a connection with its object by dint of an abstract (social) relation that modifies the knowledge of the visible externalities. As such, the silhouette is typical of the representational sign in the modern episteme as discussed by Michel Foucault in *The Order of Things* where "The condition of [the links that can join the various elements of representation together] resides ... outside representation, beyond its immediate visibility, in a sort of behind-the-scenes world even deeper and more dense than representation itself" (239). Indeed, the abstract relation that links the signifier and the signified is – should Lavater again provide a clue – the self-knowledge of existing, the idea that the silhouette holds not so much one's shape as the meaning of one's existence: "Yet it is undeniable, and shall be made evident by example to the lover of truth, that numberless countenances are so characterized, even by shades, that nothing can be more certain than the signification of these shades" (*Essays* 192).[16] Anyone projected as a silhouette is known exclusively by a composite that subordinates all external structures, lines, curves, marks, spots, and blemishes to a shadowy void made intelligible by the fact it performs the function of character and identity, a performance composed by the physiognomist. Both the expert and the enthusiastic amateur are thus given free range with a silhouette or shadow to assert in the name of physiognomical science whatever they may about another member of society. The resulting appreciation is therefore most likely to be that invention most suitable to the needs of the physiognomist or the normative influences he espouses.

---

[15] "nur Eine[r] Linie; keine Bewegung, kein Licht, keine Farbe, keine Höhe und Tiefe; kein Aug', kein Ohr – kein Nasloch, keine Wange, – nur ein sehr kleiner Theil von der Lippe"(153).

Since the discourse of the shadow is engaged as a system that caters to normative demands, and its material is used to allot each person a place in society at society's convenience, I argue that Peter Schlemihl's shadow appears not as his honest duplication but, rather, as a deceitful doppelgänger. With a shadow, Schlemihl has an assigned role in society; he possesses a given identity that makes sense in the context of physiognomical discourse. But this identifiable role secured by bearing a shadow is the product of physiognomy and may not exactly correlate to Schlemihl's self. With a shadow, his personage conforms to a shape designed to attain acceptance and integration. The shadow-signifier is programmed to refer not to an absent signified as Kuzniar maintains ("'Spurlos'" 190, 193), but to a mythical or fabricated signified. As Lavater remarks, though admittedly not with the above evaluation of physiognomy as social strategy in mind: "the shade, generally, expresses much more of original propensity than actual character" (*Essays* 194).[17]

The north German society among which Peter Schlemihl disembarks at the beginning of the story takes no time at all to integrate him and assign him a place within its hierarchy, whether that be stowed out of the way in the attic by the servant at the inn (17),[18] or a superficially welcome, yet persistently unremarkable and unappreciated, position in relation to the local bourgeoisie gathered at Thomas John's garden party (17, 18, 19). Again, at the beginning of the tale, Schlemihl, a man still in full possession of a shadow, must already fit in (cf. C. Butler 8; cf. Kuzniar, "'Spurlos'" 193; cf. Schulz 430; cf. Swales, "Mundane Magic" 253; cf. Troubetzkoy 27) since his appearance must make enough sense in order for him to be so readily dismissed or ignored. With a shadow he is seen by others as physiognomical discourse dictates: passable, albeit playing an "insignificant role" ("unbedeutende[] Rolle" 21). Indeed, so long as Schlemihl keeps his shadow or, after he has lost his shadow, "so long as the truth remained concealed" ("so lange die Wahrheit nur verborgen blieb" 32) by his commandeering the protection of the dark seclusion of his private room (26, 30), of the shade cast by the walls of buildings (27), of his servant Bendel's shadow (32, 36), the shelter of the inside of his carriage (35, 36), or cover of forest (39), he maintains the physiognomical charade to pass as some member of society (cf. Freund 38-39), from an insignificant guest at the garden party to a purported eloquent intellectual (32), the King of Prussia traveling under the alias of Count Peter (36ff.), a hardened businessman (39), or the heroic projection of Mina's imagination (42). Whichever role Schlemihl may come to embody, Thomas Mann is correct when in an essay from 1911 he maintains the shadow represents for Schlemihl the state of "all bourgeois respectability and human belonging" ("aller bürgerlichen Solidität und menschlichen Zugehörigkeit," "Chamisso" 537).

---

[16] "Aber dann ist's unwidersprechlich, und Beyspiele werden's jedem Freunde der Wahrheit beweisen, daß unzählige Gesichter sich durch den bloßen Schattenriß solchergestalt charakterisieren, daß man von seiner Existenz kaum gewisser werden kann, als von der Bedeutung dieser Silhouetten" (159).

[17] "*Ueberhaupt drückt die Silhouette vielmehr die Anlage, als die Wirklichkeit des Charakters aus*" (161).

[18] Freund points out that the servant needs to take only one look at Schlemihl to locate him by his outward appearance as being low on the social scale (25).

However, I also argue that the knowledge of Schlemihl's 'bare' face strikes a remarkable contrast to the physiognomical inferences of his all-important shadow. Without a shadow, Schlemihl is no longer revealed as what he appears to be, but is exposed for what he *is*. In other words, he is without whatever artificial meaning physiognomical material had provided him. He is without the guise that made him acceptable and, so, appears antisocial. Without his shadow, the character Schlemihl lacks the material required by professional physiognomists to locate him firmly and appropriately within humanity. As such, the character Schlemihl falls outside the authoritative categorizing discourse on human worth and identity into an even more popular discourse on the knowledge of the face prevalent among a physiognomically attuned public. And as such, the story *Schlemihl* occupies a unique literary vantage point from which to mount a theoretical critique of the process of physiognomy and the popular systems that construct or foreordain an individual's nature and vocation.

Without his shadow or the cover of shade, the once hidden truth of Schlemihl must come to light. Before he found a position: at first one that elicited the benign neglect of the people about him, or later one to which they devoted all their attention. But now public opinion quickly turns against him.[19] The shadowless Schlemihl becomes a noticeable object of revilement (24) and he rouses the pity of women, the scorn of youth, and the contempt of men (27). As made clear by the taunts of "all these learned suburban street urchins," Schlemihl can no longer pass within the discourse of social norms since "'Respectable people are accustomed to taking their shadows with them when they go walking in the sun.'"[20] That is, he lacks the physiognomical wherewithal to play any kind of defined role in society. Indeed, as if the sight of Schlemihl's naked face defies belief, "one sweet and pretty girl" even hides her own face on realizing he is shadowless (27).

Though by losing his shadow Schlemihl falls out of one discourse of identity, this does not in any way mean that he entirely loses identity (Weissberg 304; cf. Gille 77; cf. Loeb 405; cf. Schulz 433; cf. Stoichita 171). The fiction of his life reveals that he must exchange an acceptable appearance conceived within an authoritative form of physiognomy – such as the silhouettes sanctioned by Lavater – for an unacceptable one effected by the more casual – though no less accurately informed – popular physiognomy of direct impressions of the face.

The social significance of the physiognomical material of the shadow over the appearance of the unscreened face is nowhere made more apparent than in the episode where Schlemihl invites an artist to his room. The only person other than his servant Bendel allowed access to Schlemihl's private chambers, the artist is asked, behind locked doors and under the strictest oath of secrecy, to paint a sheet shadow ("Schlagschatten") of Schlemihl so he may evade his undesirable circumstances (30). Clearly repulsed by Schemihl's condition and his request, the artist leaves taking a penetrating look at him though he could not bear the sight of him and only after recommending that "'A person without a shadow should stay out of the sun. That is the safest and most rational course.'"[21] Schlemihl is left hiding his face in his hands (31; a gesture repeated later [51]). For several reasons, this episode is of importance for any analysis of the story from the standpoint of physiognomy and the meaning or function of the shadow. First of all, it explicitly reveals a dichotomy between the effect and knowledge of the actual face and that of the face as represented by a shadow. Clearly, the knowledge of the shadow is an unfaithful representation of the face for, as the artist explains – as if Chamisso is refuting Lavater's claims of the physiognomical purity of the silhouette – the accuracy of any artistic rendition of Schlemihl's profile would soon be lost with the slightest movement on Schlemihl's part. Thus the shadow is exposed as an artificial and imprecise means of exacting the social significance of any individual. This episode also confirms that, whatever it is about Schlemihl's face and confession of shadowlessness that so repulses the artist, only the intervention of a shadow has the ability of concealing it and making Schlemihl acceptable again. Second, this episode is also especially significant since it shows how particularly the artist is potentially complicit in the social deception orchestrated by the physiognomical discourse of shadows. Clearly, the work of artists can contribute to the production of a material falsehood designed for the convenience of regulating social status. Finally, the artist's reaction and advice offered for Schlemihl's safety draw attention to some kind of cultural prohibition of whatever Schlemihl's bare face reveals. His words read ambiguously either as a threat implying that, for their own good, shadowless men should hide, or as an insider's precaution instructing Schlemihl to go out only under the cover of darkness. Either way, it is made abundantly clear that any association with whatever it is about Schlemihl's face that is so disturbing must be concealed in order to secure a meaningful role in society – and as the artist flees Schlemihl's apartments, it must be presumed that this includes the role of the artist.

---

[19] Péju remarks that Schlemihl is aware of the curse of shadowlessness not so much out of any intimate sense, but because others point it out to him (10-11).

[20] "der sämtlichen literarischen Straßenjugend der Vorstadt"; "'Ordentliche Leute pflegten ihren Schatten mit sich zu nehmen, wenn sie in die Sonne gingen'" (24).

---

[21] "'wer keinen Schatten hat, gehe nicht in die Sonne, das ist des Vernünftigste und Sicherste'" (31).

The shadow, then, has the function of making Schlemihl appear as an entirely acceptable figure. But without the shadow, whatever it is about him that is deemed so unacceptable to society is now made plain for all to see (presumably, including the reader). What, then, is so unacceptable about someone as observant, intelligent, and artistic as Schlemihl that ought to be kept concealed from society under the shroud of a shadow in order for him to succeed? What is the difference revealed by the lack of the shadow? What is left exposed by the absence of a normative process that enables an individual to pass off as some part of the norm? Considering the ease with which the shadow can mask Schlemihl's unacceptable difference, this difference must be something that, while indicated by the shadowless face, is not distinguishable by the features of the face alone. This would exclude any *obvious* meaning such as race, ethnicity, foreignness, or perhaps even creed, for a silhouette would not be able to obscure such generally more visible markers of identity for long without the presence of the original face bringing into ridicule any contrary physiognomical claims. The unacceptable difference must be some character trait that in its facial form remains invisible to the uninitiated and that thus enables physiognomy to omit or conceal it during the process of transcribing the face as a shadow or silhouette. This intentional oversight assists the individual to pass as part of the social norm.

If Schlemihl's face does not immediately signal his status as belonging to a purportedly visible group – as an ethnic non-German like Chamisso or as a Jew as the wandering Schlemihl / Number Twelve's tablet in the Schlemihlium purports – then his underlying or residual identity must be that of a practically invisible minority distinguishable more by behavior than simply by outward appearance. Secondary literature has tossed up numerous suggestions as to the meaning or function of the shadow, all of which seemingly offering a more or less viable explanation as it relates to Chamisso's tale. The shadow and its loss are read by some critics as symbolizing – autobiographical – expatriation, statelessness, or divided allegiances between two cultures (Adnes; Boyd; Coquio; Kapp; Krauss; Kroner; Mimoso-Ruiz; G. Müller; Schrader; van Stockum/van Dam; Wühr), an uncertain existence (Lahnstein), the possession or lack of the acceptable social, religious, moral, and physical external constituents of identity (Nadler; Ramondt; Weissberg), and the removal of national – that is, *völkisch* – bonds and the reassertion of racial conscience (Spier). Some other critics say that the loss of the shadow expresses the preordination of the outsider (C. Butler), the misfortune of the pariah (Péju), and the opposition between appearance and being (Eichendorff; Nettesheim; Riegel). Further critics see in the lost shadow the dilemma of bourgeois integration or social assimilation (Coquio; Koepke; Korff; Kroner; Lübbe-Grothues; Mann "Chamisso"; Scherer/Walzel; Ude; von Wiese), class conflict (Leschnitzer), the complex struggle or mediation between the individual and society or reality (E. F. Hoffmann; V. Hoffmann; Miller; von Wiese; Wührl), hidden social relations (Schumacher), the conscious development of the identity of a social type (Brockhagen), and the dynamics of social (Feudel; V. Hoffmann; Loeb; Swales, "Mundane Magic"; von Wilpert; Walach), psychosociological (Berger, "Drei phantastische Erzählungen"; Schaefer/Grohnert; Schneider; Weigand), or communicative (Gille) interpersonal relations based on the economic conditions of early capitalism and the consequent loss of established moral norms (Freund; Schleucher) such as virtue and merit (Gille). Still further critics raise the issue of outward honor (Ramondt; Schapler) or personal honesty (Mann "Chamisso"), the dissatisfactoriness of money (Fink, "la démonisation"), and the human tendency to suppose a value for something it does not really have (Troubetzkoy). Several even believe that the loss of the shadow represents a psychodynamic lesson in postmetaphysical modernity (Hörisch), the difference between public and personal estimations of one's attributes (Corin), the sacrifice of possessions and reputation for the protection of the inner self (Wisse), the fleeting effect of personality in an inconstant world (Heinisch), an individual character's psychological flaws (Hohoff) or schizophrenic complexes (Baumgartner; Rougemont), the psychological process of individuation (Neumarkt; Pracht-Fitzell), a pre-Freudian castration fantasy (Pinsker), the loss of virility (Tymms), the expression and rejection of a vivid and delirious erotic imagination (Tunner), and the Christian, moral, or existential struggle between good and bad (Boutin; Croce; Danès; Flores; Kern; Lösch; Müssle; Pavlyshyn; Scherer/Walzel; White/White). Others suppose that losing the shadow demonstrates a dialogue with the popular sentimentality of the time (Atkins), the confusion of the modern artist (Mann "Chamisso") or the social and emotional development of the particularly poetic or scholarly individual (Arenberg; Detering; Pavlyshyn; Renner; Schulz; Schumacher), introspection (Schwann), and a rite of passage (Arenberg; Boutin; Pille). Finally, some critics consider the lost shadow in terms of the relation of the sign and the object (Kuzniar, "'Spurlos'"; Renner; Weissberg), and the impossibility of achieving any definitive interpretation or meaning (C. Butler; Chabozy; Croce; Eichendorff; Feudel; Kuzniar, "'Spurlos'"; Neubauer; Péju; Pongs; Schneider; Schulz; Ude; Weigand; Wührl). Though each of these scholarly contributions attempts to unravel the riddle of Chamisso's *Schlemihl* in its own way, one by one they ultimately fall short of mounting a convincing argument for one reason alone – and they certainly constitute an accumulated body of work that merely defers its subject (Kuzniar, "'Spurlos'" 189-94). Indeed, each of the above suggestions in turn fails to name that one behavioral factor that historically more than any other – more than an allegiance to any nationality, ethnic group, class, or creed, more than any show of personal fortune or psychological condition – would obstruct a hero's development within social relations by garnering the unmitigated collective disdain and ignorance of the majority of early-nineteenth-century German society: namely, male-male erotic love.[22]

Indeed, no interpretation has explained exactly which horror it is that makes Peter Schlemihl obliged not only to conceal his shadowlessness, but also to hide his face. And none of the above has offered any explanation for what it is that is embodied in Schlemihl's shadowlessness and considered so utterly deplorable that it should cause him so much anguish that his hair turn gray (59), that it should rile his servant Rascal enough to warrant an outburst from him demanding his dismissal (44-45), and particularly that a mob should smash his windows and the local police should give him 24 hours to leave town (60). The significance of whatever is revealed by Schlemihl's shadowlessness must be more substantial than mere expatriation or the lack of hereditary bourgeois credentials (which could easily be compensated by a wealthy employer as Rascal's siphoning amply demonstrates). Contemporary queer theorist Lee Edelman's discussion of how, in mid-twentieth-century American culture, homosexual men are considered "identifiably different" while relying on a "disturbing invisibility" ("Tearooms and Sympathy" 558) and how "homosexuality is visibly, morphologically, or semiotically written upon the flesh" (571) leads me to make the case that only something as traditionally scandalous or supposedly threatening as homosexuality would cause such invidious reactions on the part of Rascal, the townsfolk, and the constabulary. I believe that, in his early-nineteenth-century fiction of a problematic man, Chamisso sets up the dichotomy between shade and shadowlessness to indicate how a man who is erotically inclined toward men can be at once unremarkably the same as others and exceptionally different. It is the undoing of this contradiction in the succession of formal physiognomy to popular face-gazing that makes Schlemihl "a marked man" (Weigand 210) and that gives him "the impression of this incurable disease of alienation" (Koepke xxiii) among his fellow characters and the novel's readers alike.

---

[22] Relying on Derks's findings, Richter designates 1806 as the year when the shift occurred from a culture of the "public intimacy between men" in the Enlightenment and German classicism to a culture of tacit and strict social regulation ("Winckelmann's Progeny" esp. 41 & 45-46).

Gert Mattenklott's pithy assessment of Chamisso's novel as "the ironically encoded portrayal of the biography of a homosexual in the nineteenth century"[23] has not received any critical attention from the more than a dozen works addressing the shadow that have appeared since the publication of his remarks in 1986 (Breithaupt; Brosse; Coquio; Gille; Hörisch; Mimoso-Ruiz; Mosberg; Péju; Pille; Renner; Schleucher; Troubetzkoy; Weissberg; White/White); only Heinrich Detering (157) appears to have noticed Mattenklott's assertion and Detering's monograph on the literary byproducts of the tabu of homosexuality, in turn, has yet to receive the attention it deserves. And yet, in all their brevity, the two pages Mattenklott devotes to Chamisso's novel represent the only thoroughly new take on the novel for several decades. Certainly the precursor to the modern homosexual provides an answer to the riddle of Peter Schlemihl's underlying identity. Since even before the term's inception in 1869, the homosexual has occupied the unique position of being externally indiscernible to the general population and yet also always both known to the initiated and readily divulged to the otherwise uninitiated by reference to an array of covert or ambiguous external signs. And though he might well be the first, Peter Schlemihl would not be the only literary example of the schlemiel as a homosexual, since the protagonist and schlemiel Arthur Fidelman of Bernard Malamud's *Pictures of Fidelman* eventually becomes a lover also of men (Wisse 110-18).

---

[23] "die ironisch verschlüsselte Darstellung der Biographie eines Homosexuellen im 19. Jahrhundert" (115).

Unfortunately, Mattenklott provides no textual evidence to support his claim on *Peter Schlemihl* as a homosexual biography and his interpretation is new only insofar as it is to the point. Indeed, the possibility of the shadowless Schlemihl being a homosexual deep down might not necessarily have escaped the attention of earlier readers. Julius Schapler perhaps already refers to the homosexual when remarking that Schlemihl has 'sinned against nature.' Probably it is the homosexual to which the closet-case Thomas Mann alludes when, in his essays "Chamisso" and "Peter Schlemihl," he remarks in a formulaic manner that the story constitutes "the portrayal of an apparently privileged and enviable existence that is, however, romantically miserable and made inwardly lonely by a dark secret."[24] This certainly would be true to Mann's form. And in fact, he continues to ask revealingly "What was Schlemihl? Did he exist at all? A nothing and an everything? An indescribable, everywhere familiar and everywhere impossible unperson?" and to insist that Schlemihl "endeavors so pitifully to settle down with his curse," that the story is "nothing but a profoundly true-to-life portrayal of the suffering of a branded and excluded person."[25] Mann is at his most cryptic and hence – to the reader who knows the works of Mann – also at his most obvious in regard to signaling homosexuality when commenting on a brief citation from some of Chamisso's autobiographical writing: "'There I was,' said Chamisso ... 'in the years when a boy matures to a man, alone and completely without upbringing ... I spent the darkest time in Berlin.' He knew the torment of a problematic adolescent existence."[26] The repetition of the word "düster" – in the overall context of misery, a secret, loneliness, the indescribable, the impossible, the nonhuman, a curse, suffering, the branded, the excluded, and torment – is sufficient for Mann rhetorically to implicate Chamisso's torments of youth in the secret of Schlemihl's existence and to insinuate homosexuality at the root of both. It is in this context that Mann's physical description of Chamisso as a good-looking man can be taken for a covert signal of Chamisso's covert identity as a man erotically attracted to men. Similarly concerned with the author's biography, Volker Hoffmann does not mince his words when identifying the homoeroticism underlying Chamisso's circle of friends (the "Nordsternbund") (672). Likewise, Rolf Günter Renner considers homoerotic sensibilities to form part of the basis of Chamisso's fantasy (659-60). And Paul Derks's brief references to Chamisso's consideration of homosexuality (esp. 98-99, 106, 220, 271) also suggest that, if Mann is insinuating anything of this kind in his essays, he was probably right on the mark. Unfortunately, neither Hoffmann nor Renner develops this aspect and Derks does not discuss the *Schlemihl* story at all.[27]

---

[24] "die Schilderung einer scheinbar bevorzugten und beneidenswerten, aber romantisch elenden, innerlich mit einem düstern Geheimnis einsamen Existenz" ("Chamisso" 530; rpt. in "Peter Schlemihl" 541).

[25] "Was war [Schlemihl], wer war er überhaupt? Ein Nichts und ein Alles? Eine unumschreibbare, überall heimisch und überall unmögliche Unperson?" ("Chamisso" 536); "sich mit seinem Fluche so leidlich einzurichten sucht" (531; rpt., 542); "nichts als eine tief erlebte Schilderung der Leiden eines Gezeichneten und Ausgeschlossenen" (537).

[26] "'So stand ich,' sagt [Chamisso] ... 'in den Jahren, wo der Knabe zum Manne heranreift, allein, durchaus ohne Erziehung ... verbrachte ich in Berlin die düstere Zeit.' Er kannte die Qualen der jugendlich problematischen Existenz"("Chamisso" 536).

Paul Neumarkt's explanation of the absence of Schlemihl's shadow draws on the twentieth-century psychoanalytical interpretations of Carl G. Jung. Such a parallel is helpful for understanding Schlemihl's predicament to be that of a homosexual. According to Jung, the shadow represents all elements of the Unconsciousness or the repressed and 'vile' contents of human character can sometimes be valuable for human development when brought under conscious control (cf. Chetwynd 131-35; Matthews 171-72). Following Jung, Neumarkt implies that the loss of Schlemihl's shadow forms part of a process of individuation since the repressed elements of his character now rise to the surface and are integrated into his persona (121-22). The Ego (waking consciousness) is thus transformed by growing into the Self (shadow) and the individual arrives at the conviction of his True Self. Neumarkt also cites Jung's claim that the personal unconscious or shadow is projected in dreams and myths as a person of the same sex, which may account for instances of homosexuality, father-transferences in men, and mother-transferences in women (122). Unfortunately, Neumarkt explains away "Jung's suggestion that repressive homosexual tendencies might possibly be involved ... as a fixation of unresolved childhood complexes which prevent the hero from reaching the full experience of the objective in his [heterosexual] love affairs" (123). Thus the critic turns his attention to the question of father-transference in the Chamisso-like introvert Schlemihl's relationship first with the poet (Ego) and then with the Gray Man (Self) – who according to a Jungian reading must be the projection of the once repressed extrovert side of the protagonist. Neumarkt would have done well not to have dismissed the aspect of homosexuality so quickly since, I believe, an account of *Peter Schlemihl* from the perspective of the presence of homosexuality reveals much both about the meaning of the shadow as it appears in this story and about Chamisso's motivation for writing about life without a shadow. Such an inquiry would also have given further weight to Neumarkt's thesis that Chamisso's novel anticipates certain aspects of Jung's psychological symbolism by more than a century.

---

[27] Ramondt's discussion of *Peter Schlemihl* (perhaps unintentionally) situates the story in the context of homoerotically charged fiction. She compares Chamisso's work to similar works by Danish author Hans Christian Andersen and by Dutch author Louis Couperus. Ramondt asserts that Andersen wrote his tale *The Shadow* as a parable of the painful rejection he suffered by one of his foster father's sons after the latter had "secured Andersen's special affection" ("[Andersen's] bizondere genegenheid verworven" 102). Couperus's story *The Shadow* tells of how a man's shadow disassociates himself from the man, and how, when they are reunited later, their roles are reversed, the shadow becomes man and the man becomes shadow. Ramondt explains that "They feel affection almost even love for each other" ("Zij voelen genegenheid zelfs bijna liefde voor elkaar" 103). Though Ramondt does not comment directly on the matter of sexuality, her references to clear instances of same-sex affection regarding the other two works would seem to imply the same homoerotic motivation for *Peter Schlemihl*. I would like to express my gratitude to L. Adien Dubbelboer for the reading and translation of the original Dutch.

It is thus not until the fourth chapter of Heinrich Detering's recent book *Das offene Geheimnis* that there becomes available any extensive treatment of the canonical *Peter Schlemihl* that is not determined by the gender-political mechanism of heteronormative reading and, thus, clearly signals specific points of queerness (cf. Lorey/Plews, esp. xviii-xix). Detering discusses Chamisso's novel as one of a series of literary works by a range of authors from Johann Joachim Winckelmann to Thomas Mann whose emergence can be considered the aesthetic product of or response to the social repression of male-male love or homosexuality, in general, and the camouflaged transposition of such private feelings on the part of the author into a published and public medium, in particular (9-38). Taking his cue from Mattenklott's reading of the tale as a homosexual biography, Detering makes use of the correspondence between Chamisso and his close friend Louis De la Foye to form the basis of his analysis of the structure of *Peter Schlemihl* as the effect of specifically homoerotic sensibility and experience and erotic stigmatization (157-60). Detering draws attention to the essential moment in Schlemihl's story at the beginning of Chapter VII when the protagonist realizes that his selling his shadow, an event that he once considered a hasty mistake, was actually a necessary stroke of fate (162). Pointing out that it is formulated in sentences that break off in their midst, Detering regards the verbal contract enabling the sale of the shadow as containing some proviso that is hushed up; that the request and sale show traces of pursuit founded in erotic attraction (163-64). Detering thus tentatively arranges Schlemihl's story into the following summarized series of events: the hero's surrender to a homoerotic proposition and his recognition of his own homoerotic tendencies; his reconciliation with himself by way of necessity; the refusal to sell the Gray Man his soul and thereby retrieve his shadow and the appearance of social decency; the consequent implication of the refusal of a homoerotic relationship in favor of self-sacrifice (165). To put it more bluntly, I similarly contend that the loss of the shadow occurs during a casual sexual encounter, an event that becomes the very catalyst for Schlemihl's eventual self-realization or *coming out* as a gay man.

While extremely illuminating and engaging, the remainder of Detering's chapter on Chamisso does not develop his initial explication of the Schlemihlian text so much for the sake of the text or for its commentary of the conditions on homoeroticism as they relate to making a literary living. Rather, Detering largely loses sight of the meaning and aesthetic implications of the shadow lurking in *Peter Schlemihl*, preferring to gather biographical evidence in order to show the full extent of the parallels between author and character, to regard the novel as an attempt by the author to understand himself or as a fictionalization of the autobiographical and so account for the creative process (172).

I shall now endeavor to add further textual evidence to the claim that Chamisso's Schlemihl is homosexual. Such an account not only assists the explanation of the ulterior function of the shadow in this particular story, but also sheds significant light on the motivation for the modern conspiratorial operations of physiognomical discourse especially as it relates to those who are allowed to occupy positions of intellectual influence. I shall show that the physiognomical shade is an authoritative means of controlling – not so much in the sense of psychological integration (cf. Neumarkt) as that of covering up – those repressed elements of one's personality widely considered undesirable to the pursuit of particular vocations; that from the story of Peter Schlemihl one learns that any overt indication of homosexuality is incompatible with the assumption of an esteemed social position; that without his shadow or the cover of shade Schlemihl's homosexuality becomes visible for all – and not just for the initiated – to read on his face if so instructed; and that Schlemihl not so much 'refuses a homoerotic relationship in favor of self-sacrifice' (cf. Detering 165), as he eventually learns to accept his queer disposition and traces out a new path for himself.

But what textual evidence is there in *Peter Schlemihl* to corroborate the argument that the protagonist's shadowless face indicates the unfiltered knowledge of his homosexuality and not one or more of a whole host of other possible meanings? Are there instances within the text that indicate that Schlemihl is more than merely uncomfortable with heterosexual relations (cf. Arenberg 28; C. Butler 10-12; Neumarkt 123; Walach 292) and is actually drawn to other men? Detering's unprecedented appraisal of the Gray Man's blushing, stuttering shyness, and passionate admiration during his initial encounter with Schlemihl and the purchase of the latter's shadow, both as indicative of the 'offensive' nature of the request and as bearing the signs of erotic pursuit in which the hero surrenders to a homoerotic proposition and recognizes his own homoerotic tendencies (164-65), is a starting point that certainly invites further commentary and verification based on other incidences in the text. At first, the two men 'pass' so well among Thomas John's party-goers that they both remain entirely unremarkable to them, and this is all the more surprising considering the tricks the Gray Man performs (18, 19, 20, 20, 21). This common experience of being disregarded immediately sets up a relation of likeness between Schlemihl and the Gray Man – "there was as little interest in the Gray man as there was in me"[28] – which confirms their both belonging to an invisible minority. Schlemihl is the only person to notice the Gray Man (just as the Gray Man is eventually the only person to notice Schlemihl) and, wanting to know more about the shadowy figure – "I would gladly have had some information regarding the man"[29] – Schlemihl approaches a third man with the intention of learning the Gray Man's identity. It is interesting that, from his indistinctiveness, the young man Schlemihl chooses to approach also bears some similarity to Schlemihl and the Gray Man: "I walked up to a young man who seemed to me to be of a lesser standing than the others and who had more often stood alone."[30] The party guests, then, comprise of more than a few passable, yet marginal, characters, and Schlemihl is clearly in the company of like men. Yet it is the Gray Man who tweaks Schlemihl's curiosity; he admits to having a weird ("unheimlich") feeling about him (20) and also to being unable to take his eyes off of him before deciding to steal his way from the society gathered at Thomas John's (21). This fascination certainly has affectionate undertones. It is the beauty of Schlemihl's shadow that so enamors the Gray Man (Chamisso 22); his desire to possess it recalls the myth of the origins of painting in Pliny's story of the Corinthian silhouette in which a young woman draws the outline of her lover's shadow on a wall as a keepsake by which to remember him during his absence – a story also alluded to by the picture that concludes the preface to Lavater's *Physiognomical Fragments* and again acknowledged in the section on silhouettes entitled "Ueber Schattenrisse" (Lavater 13 & 153; cf. Weissberg 295-98[31]).

---

[28] "man bekümmerte sich nicht mehr um den grauen Mann als um mich selber" (19).

What Chamisso then describes through Schlemihl as autobiographical narrator – and what Mattenklott terms "A seduction scene of the usual kind between two men" ("Eine Verführungsszene gewöhnlicher Art zwischen zwei Männern" 115) and what Detering quaintly calls "wooing" ("Werbung" 164) – is, indeed, nothing other than the confession of a standard gay cruising scene and a casual sexual encounter. Following Schlemihl's continuous ogling of and brief inquiry after the conspicuously inconspicuous Gray Man, taking place in the park-like seclusion of a rose garden, replete with furtive backward glances, the innocuous and reciprocated gestures of removing one's hat and bowing, an embarrassed downcast head, mutual blushing, often only stammering out half-sentences or tentative utterances in cautiously hushed, imploring, and apologetic, yet calmly persistent, tones, as well as references to the trepidation of being encountered, astonishment of being approached, the nervous sensation of being transfixed, and the dizziness and disbelief upon receiving a proposition (21-23), the encounter between Schlemihl and the Gray Man exhibits much of the stock-in-trade of cruising. It is, for example, remarkably similar to the homophile German sexologist Magnus Hirschfeld's 1914 documented descriptions of the ways homosexual men make contact with each other in public places:

---

[29] "Ich hätte gern Aufschluß über den Mann gehabt" (20).

[30] "Ich ... trat an einem jungen Mann heran, der mir von minderem Ansehen schien als die andern und der öfter allein gestanden hatte" (20).

[31] Weissberg believes the episode in Chamisso's novel when Schlemihl approaches an artist to paint his silhouette as a substitute for his shadow is a reference to the myth of the origin of painting (Weissberg 306). But clearly the Gray Man's proposition to take Schlemihl's shadow is a much more direct and, therefore, likelier reference to Pliny's original story since only this scene accounts for the original motive of the lover's desire.

> The Uranian looking for an affair notices an acceptable male person. He endeavors to make himself noticeable to that person, looks at him, stands still, looks around, and waits to see if the other man reacts to this sign. Should this seems to be the case, he tries to lead the other man to a place where it will be possible to start a conversation without being disturbed – in a quiet side street, in front of a shop window, or at an advertisement or weather pillar. On the way there he makes sure of the situation by looking around and pausing to see if the man in question is really following. Once both men have reached their destination and are close enough to one another, the Uranian – if the chosen one doesn't prevent him – initiates contact either with a trivial remark about some object in the shop window or an announcement on the advertisement pillar, or by asking for a light or the time, or by commenting on the weather.[32]

After the proposition is made for the first time, Schlemihl ostensibly unintentionally, yet clearly responsively, addresses the Gray Man as "Good friend" ("Guter Freund" 22). The Gray Man needs only to utter his proposition once more with the offer of a sizable payment before Schlemihl complies and the former kneels down in front of the latter in order to 'remove his shadow.' This is accomplished in a manner that undeniably bears shades of an open-air male-male sexual encounter: "I saw him, with an admirable dexterity, loosen my shadow, from head to toe, from the grass, lift it up, roll it up, fold it, and finally stick it in his pocket."[33] And the orgiastic description of Schlemihl soon after playing with his new-found riches (25) should leave no doubt in the reader's mind that Schlemihl's gold is the reward for an encounter that was sexual in nature.

---

[32] "Der ein Abenteuer suchende Urning bemerkt eine ihm zusagende männliche Person; er trachtet sich ihr bemerkbar zu machen, sieht sie an, bleibt stehen, sieht sich um und wartet, ob der andere auf dieses Zeichen reagiert. Scheint ihm dies der Fall zu sein, so versuchet er, ihn an einen Ort zu dirigieren, an dem eine Ansprache ungestört bewerkstelligt werden kann, in eine stille Seitenstraße oder vor ein Schaufenster, an eine Anschlag- oder Wettersäule. Auf dem Weg dahin vergewissert er sich nochmals durch Umschauen und Innehalten, ob der Betreffende auch folgt. Sind nun beide an einem Ort angelangt und nahe genug beieinander, dann leitet der Uranier, falls der Erwählte ihm nicht zuvorkommt, die Anknüpfung entweder mit einer gleichgültigen Bemerkung über irgendein Gegenstand in der Schaufensterauslage oder einer Ankündigung an der Anschlagsäule, einer Bitte um Feuer, einer Frage nach der Zeit, einer Äußerung über das Wetter ein" (In Theis/Sternweiler 49-50).

The initial encounter with the Gray Man is not the only occasion when Schlemihl goes cruising. Shortly after trading his shadow for money (did he prostitute himself?), Schlemihl steps out again at night ostensibly in order "to test public opinion once again" ("die öffentliche Meinung noch einmal zu prüfen" 26). Certainly Schlemihl is checking to see just how far he may go with his newly activated proclivity: "At this time the nights were lit by the moon. Late in the evening I threw on a large coat, pulled my hat over my eyes and, trembling like a criminal, sneaked out of the house. Only when I reached an out-of-the-way place did I leave the protective shadow of the houses and step into the moonlight. Only then was I ready to hear my fate from the mouths of the passers-by."[34] On other occasions, Schlemihl wants "to do a quick check" ("bloß Probe halten" 32), he chases a bodyless shadow only to end up embracing the hard body of a man (52), and he wanders in a forest-garden where he again meets the Gray Man (53). Also, the fact that he seeks the attentions of the forester's submissive daughter Mina in the woods with the same display of checked glances and stammering (37, 39-40) as that of his encounter with the Gray Man only further confirms retrospectively the erotic character of that earlier encounter with an equally as submissive person (19, 19, 20, 21, 21) in a practically identical place. (For Schlemihl, however, relationships with women have primarily to do with the head and not with the heart [33].)

---

[33] "mit einer bewundernswürdigen Geschicklichkeit sah ich ihn meinen Schatten, vom Kopf bis zu meinen Füßen, leise von dem Grase lösen, aufheben, zusammenrollen und falten und zuletzt einstecken" (23).

[34] "Die Nächte waren zu der Zeit mondhell. Abends spät warf ich einen weiten Mantel um, drückte mir den Hut tief in die Augen und schlich, zitternd wie ein Verbrecher, aus dem Hause. Erst auf einem entlegenen Platz trat ich aus dem Schatten der Häuser, in deren Schutz ich soweit gekommen war, an das Mondeslicht hervor, gefaßt, mein Schicksal aus dem Munde der Vorübergehenden zu vernehmen" (26-27).

Schlemihl's cruising is not the only indication of the centrality of the question of homosexuality in Chamisso's novel. Schemihl's initial arrival at a port where he enters "the next, most modest-looking inn" ("das nächste, geringste Haus" 17) to find lodgings and his later trip to a "little-frequented spa" ("wenig besuchten Badeort" 34) are brief, yet significant, textual markers alluding to places that, like certain parts of public parks and gardens (Steakley 1975, 15), the popular imagination often considers notorious locations of illicit sexual, and particularly homosexual, activity. The party at Thomas John's is also a covert sign of queer goings-on, not so much for the Gray Man's fantastic tricks, but for the fact that the party-giver's name is an inversion of the common English expression "John Thomas," which is both a generic name for a livery servant and slang for penis. Could it be that the Gray Man, who at one point pulls three horses from his pocket (21) and later pulls the remains of Thomas John out of his pocket (66), had inverted the circumstances of a one-time livery servant John Thomas to create the outward appearance of the successful and influential Thomas John as a reward for secret sexual favors? Is this not similar to Schlemihl's predicament engendered by his contact with the Gray Man and to which he alludes using terms that due to their vagueness and general applicability have long been used by insiders covertly to communicate instances of homosexuality? In Schlemihl's case, such terms include "Geheimnis" ("secret" [in the prefacing letters 3, 5,] 31, 41, 42, 60), "Scham," "Angst," and "Verzweiflung" ("shame," "fear," "despair" 35), "Fluch" ("curse" 41, 42), "Elend" ("misery" 41, 42, 51), and "Unglück" ("misfortune" 50). The Gray Man is in the habit of discussing his relationship with Schlemihl more openly in the terms of love and friendship. He refers to himself as a "Liebhaber" ("lover" or "admirer" 48), at another point he offers Schlemihl his shadow back in order to remain in his company (62), and, endeavoring to have his way, he adopts a practical attitude to the codependence of his connection with Schlemihl when he remarks: "'I'm sorry that you don't love me, but you can still make use of me.’”[35] Even the fictional Chamisso twice remarks about Schlemihl: “I loved him” (“Ich hatte ihn lieb” 3, 3). For his own part, Schlemihl is more attracted to Bendel (26) whom he often embraces (34, 40, 59, 61) and who is the only person allowed into his room (39). Indeed, this master-servant relationship is something out of the ordinary and yet has none of the frightening undertones of the Gray Man’s relationship with Thomas John about which Schlemihl remarks: “I was afraid almost more of the gentleman’s servant than of the gentleman served”[36] – the double entendres of gentlemen-servants and gentlemen served should not be overlooked. Finally, the young blond from whom Schlemihl buys his seven-league boots is remarkable enough for one commentator to ask whether he is “his good angel?” and, so, in all innocence to draw attention to the boy’s attractiveness (Boyd xxxiii).

Considering the above details of Schlemihl and the Gray Man’s mutual fascination, Schlemihl’s cruising habits, the ambiguous nature of the urban landscape, the cryptic lexicon, and the unusual dynamics of some of the interpersonal relationships, the astute reader cannot but notice that the fiction of Schlemihl’s shadowlessness is an inscription of his underlying difference as homosexual. Likewise, Chamisso makes it clear that physiognomical shade effectively conceals Schlemihl’s homosexuality with a formal performance that readily enables him to ‘pass,’ thus occasioning social assimilation and even generating economic or symbolic influence. As von Wiese maintains, “Casting a shadow indicates the way in which an individual is integrated into social life at any one time.”[37] This operation is never more explicit than when Schlemihl is wooing Mina. All along, Mina senses something suspicious about her suitor since he appears only under the cover of the forest (41, 45). Once he is exposed as shadowless, it is made clear that the intervention of any shadow will do to make Schlemihl acceptable once more (46). It is important here to emphasize that it does not matter which shadow he chooses to represent himself since each shadow refers to some signified and, so, is sufficiently physiognomically empowered to enable him to fit in (cf.

---

[35] “‘Sie lieben mich nicht, das ist mir leid. Sie können mich darum doch benutzen’” (63).

[36] “ich fürchtete mich fast noch mehr vor den Herren Bedienten als vor den bedienten Herren” (20).

[37] “Der geworfene Schatten zeigt an, in welche Weise der Einzelmensch jeweils in das soziale Leben eingeordnet ist” (110).

Kuzniar, "'Spurlos'" 194-95; Weigand 210, 221). Thus, deception per se is not an issue; a problem arises only when the deception is inadequate or absent. The shadow is thus an artificial social mechanism that manipulates the knowledge of the face in order to conceal its truth from society in general. Or, as Ernst Fedor Hoffmann puts it, Schlemihl's shadow "was clearly felt to be a visual disguise whose content was understood to be the appearance of known reality."[38] The shadow also serves as an open secret for others more in the know such as the servant and the proprietor at the inn, the artist-figure, or the Gray Man. Indeed, remembering the advice offered the shadowless Schlemihl by the artist-figure, and presuming Schlemihl's shadowlessness attests to his homosexual tendencies, the prohibition to which the episode with the artist draws attention is that of open homosexuality: not just the shadowless, but queer men should conceal this aspect of their lives if they wish to assume an acceptable role in society. Chamisso's innovative portrayal of a man who loses his shadow and who, at first, makes every effort either to find an alternative or to retrieve it confides that artists, intellectuals, aristocrats, businessmen, bourgeois pretenders, stableboys, and husbands-to-be, should they also be homosexual, can keep the then socially unacceptable knowledge of their homosexuality under cover with the more acceptable persona offered by the shades of physiognomy. In the first instance, it appears that Chamisso endorses the operation of physiognomy by telling the sorry tale of a man too klutzy to realize the deceiving value of his shadow and so suffers the consequences of public condemnation and banishment.

But Chamisso's response to the prohibition of queer aesthetes and intellectuals both aided and evaded by physiognomy is far more critical than it first appears. Chamisso indicates that the shadow is as oppressive as shadowlessness is disturbing and isolating. Drawing attention to their romantic involvement ("Liebhaber"), the Gray Man offers to return Schlemihl's socially integrating shadow in exchange for the arithmetically unquantifiable contents of his soul: "'You should be happy to find an admirer who, during your lifetime, in order to acquire this X, this galvanic energy, this polarizing force, or whatever this foolish thing may be, is willing to pay with something real, namely your shadow incarnate, by which you can attain your beloved’s hand and the fulfillment of all your wishes.’”[39] This is the Gray Man’s most revealing ruse since returning the shadow to Schlemihl and, hence, public circulation is the surest way of taking control of Schlemihl’s soul (cf. Freund 42). After all, the modern shadow best serves not its bearer, but the normative culture of physiognomy that has engendered it. And the Gray Man is in the best position to know this since he himself refers to himself with exactly the type of description commonly used to define a physiognomist. Just before his final proposition, the Gray Man draws attention to his own identity by way of his outward appearance: “‘Can’t you tell by looking at me? A poor devil – at once a kind of scholar and scientist – who earns poor thanks from his friends for his fantastic arts, and whose only amusement on earth consists of his spot of experimenting.’”[40] Retrieving the shadow of physiognomical discourse would spell soul-suicide for Schlemihl (64) since he would be damned to lead a double life such as that led by Thomas John / John Thomas or by the Gray man himself – whose physical body at one point cowers invisibly beneath an extremely alluring shadow (51-53). Schlemihl would thus never be able to realize his True Self. In the final assessment, Chamisso reveals the hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie and the lie of the order of human nature based on the knowledge of appearance. Indeed, Schlemihl resorts to lying on three separate occasions to explain the absence of his shadow (30, 46, 68), thus revealing the falsehood of the shadow itself. Furthermore, the same people who would have Schlemihl condemned accept others who make use of physiognomical deception – these are the men who, like the “corpulent” Thomas John (17), are curiously well-endowed with a shadow: “especially those big, corpulent men who cast a broad shadow,” the businessman at the spa town who “cast a broad, if somewhat pale shadow before him," and Rascal who "of course has an impeccable shadow."[41] Mann is thus seen to miscall Chamisso's portrayal of the shadow's value as the mark of a person's honesty ("Chamisso" 530; rpt. in "Peter Schlemihl" 541), a point that may have intriguing ramifications for the later writer's own literary characterizations of aesthetes and intellectuals.

---

[38] "wurde offenbar als bildliche Verhüllung empfunden, deren Inhalt sich als Erscheinung der bekannten Realität finden und fassen lasse" (182).

---

[39] “‘Seien Sie doch froh, einen Liebhaber zu finden, der Ihnen bei Lebenszeit noch den Nachlaß dieses X, dieser galvanischen Kraft oder polarisierenden Wirksamkeit und was alles das närrische Ding sein soll, mit etwas Wirklichem bezahlen will, nämlich mit Ihrem leibhaftigen Schatten, durch den Sie zu der Hand Ihrer Geliebten und zu der Erfüllung aller Ihrer Wünsche gelangen können’” (48).

[40] “‘sieht man es mir nicht an? Ein armer Teufel, gleichsam so eine Art von Gelehrten und Physikus, der von seinen Freunden für vortreffliche Künste schlechten Dank erntet und für sich selber auf Erden keinen andern Spaß hat als sein bißchen Experimentieren’” (48).

The most critical and, therefore, most remarkable aspect of Chamisso's novel is the fact that the author allows his narrator and hero Peter Schlemihl not to buckle under the burden of his experience, and eventually not to go along with the charade of physiognomy. Rather, Schlemihl comes to terms with what he has done and with who he is. He rejects the deceitful discourse of shadows and *comes out*[42] by accepting the inscription of his difference in his shadowlessness as a stroke of chance that may positively impact on his own life as well as on others': "Later I made peace with myself. First I learned to respect necessity and what is greater than the done deed, the occurrence that has occurred, its effect! Then I learned also to respect this necessity as a wise stroke of fate that winds through the whole great machine in which we intrude simply as collaborating, driven and driving wheels. What should be, must happen. What had to be, happened. And not without that stroke of fate that I finally learned to respect still in my life and in the life of the person whom mine affected."[43] In short, Schlemihl refuses to give up his homosexual psyche and Chamisso shows that the tragedy of the oppressive imposition of difference can be put to emancipative use. Chamisso thus again anticipates Edelman who relates a second, oppositional, self-commodifying level of the mechanism of outlining the homosexual to the first, minoritizing, regulating level in the "double operation" in which one operation is "serving the ideological purposes of a conservative social order intent on codifying identities in its labor of disciplinary inscription, and the other [is] resistant to that categorization, intent on *de*-scribing the identities that order has so oppressively *in*scribed ... these two operations, pointing as they do in opposite directions ... entail ... on the one hand, a normalizing practice of cultural discrimination ... and on the other, a strategic resistance to that reification of sexual difference" (*Homographesis* 10).

---

[41] "besonders solcher dicken, wohlbeleibten, die selbst einen breiten Schatten warfen" (27); "einen breiten, obgleich etwas blassen Schatten von sich warf" (39); "doch einen untadeligen Schatten [hat]" (55).

[42] In "The Double Lives of Man ...," Cohen remarks that "Schematically, the coming out tale is often described as depicting a passage from the darkness, ignorance and repression of the non-self affirming 'closet' to the colourful, illuminated, self-affirming freedom of gay/lesbian/queer identity. A recent Keith Haring graphic designed to advertise National Coming Out Day makes the implications of this movement clear. In the centre of the drawing is a large black rectangle (which symbolically doubles as both the closet and the grave) from which a typically dynamic Haring figure emerges into the boldly coloured, vividly alive world of queer identity: in the same way that when Dorothy lands in Oz, suddenly the movie goes into Technicolour" (87).

[43] "Später habe ich mich mit mir selber versöhnt. Ich habe erstlich die Notwendigkeit verehren lernen, und was ist mehr als die getane Tat, das geschehene Ereignis, ihr Eigentum! Dann hab ich auch diese Notwendigkeit als eine weise Fügung verehren lernen, die durch das gesamte große Getrieb' weht, darin wir bloß als mitwirkende, getriebene treibende Räder eingreifen; was sein soll, muß geschehen, was sein sollte, geschah, und nicht ohne jene Fügung, die ich endlich noch in meinem Schicksale und dem Schicksale derer, die das meine mit angriff, verehren lernte" (57-58; cf. Detering 161-62, 165; E. F. Hoffmann 183).

Out of the components of difference, Schlemihl undertakes the construction of a new career for himself in a world that does not depend on the hypocritical machinations of the first generations of the German bourgeoisie. Clearly, the normative wisdom informing physiognomy decrees that to remain an artistic intellectual a queer author has to lead a double life under the facade of a shadow. But Peter Schlemihl rejects the physiognomical closet, maintains his difference, and becomes a natural historian as well as an autobiographer; his narrative is a coming-out story.[44] The theorist Edelman also claims that the homosexual has come into being as a visible category due to "his relation to writing or textuality, his articulation, in particular, of a 'sexual' difference internal to male identity" (*Homographesis* 9).[45] Yet he points out that writing both "describes" difference and "works simultaneously ... to 'de-scribe,' effface, or undo difference," for the very necessity of such a process, motivated as it is by a threat or heterosexual fear of otherwise having that sexual difference remain undisclosed, acknowledges that these bodies "would otherwise count as 'the same' if 'sexual identity' were not now interpreted" (*Homographesis* 10). In the hands of a queer author, the self-conscious application of this visible difference can have a liberating effect. By way of his fictional Schlemihl, Chamisso hypothesizes that it is not necessary to sacrifice the queer self in order to become a publicly recognized writer or scholar.[46] The taxonomical system used by Schlemihl in his natural historical exercises and search of categories in order to make sense of the physical world implies a postponement of the beginnings of modernity to return to the unmodified classical episteme (as described by Foucault) of Carl von Linné (Renner 658; cf. Breithaupt 253; cf. Freund 47; cf. Pavlyshyn 50-54; cf. von Wiese 115) where the object still stands for itself and does not depend on a representative synecdoche such as a shadow or silhouette for the production of meaning. As Schlemihl explains: "I have tried, with quiet, rigid, and constant industry, faithfully to portray the bright and finished model, and my self-satisfaction has depended on the coincidence of the representation with the original."[47] This endeavor is tantamount to abandoning the first traces of the modern episteme instilled in a system such as Lavater's physiognomy in which the object may be understood only by a representation that refers back to it. Perhaps this theoretical point best underlies why Chamisso's creative exercise succeeds in providing a useful working example of self-esteem and self-assertion. Here, it is important to put aside any thought that Schlemihl's *kurtka*, his servant Bendel, or his pet poodle are signals that the literary hero is the biographical extension of Chamisso and, instead, remain exclusively within the imaginary bounds of the work. Chamisso is not implying in his composition of the queer intellectual that one should rely on a representation (Schlemihl) to understand the object (Chamisso). Rather, taking his cue from the structure of thought of classical natural history, he suggests that by being one's own author, like Schlemihl, one can find full agency (cf. V. Hoffmann 681-82; cf. Renner 662-64). By the insertion of the preface as a device that introduces Schlemihl in a way that supposes he has a life beyond the story and is responsible for writing the story (4), Chamisso sets up his novel as life-writing in order to argue that the individual / Schlemihl is the only thing able truly to stand for himself.[48] By using the preface also to indicate that the work is read and commended by a group of established authors and intellectuals (Swales, "Mundane Magic" 257), Chamisso insinuates the problematic Schlemihl into a network of cultural producers who, likewise, must now seem to appear to break with hypocritical practices.

---

[44] Cohen observes that "'coming out' has served as a rubric for the processes of self-affirmation and self-definition through which men and women begin to denominate themselves as 'gay men' and 'lesbians' in their relations with themselves, their families, friends, loved ones, and communities – processes which have been central to the creation of both gay and lesbian identities and collectives. But more than just a process of emergence and nomination, 'coming out' is also a way of telling a life story. Indeed, to some extent the 'coming out story' becomes the basis for both the production *and* reproduction of an identity to which the narrating individual lays claim precisely by pronouncing this story to be his or her own" (87). Cohen also points out that the narrative structure of the coming-out story is both prospective – that is, pointing toward the narrator's future path – and retrospective – that is, a containment of the past from which the narrator has emerged (87-88). The same dynamic is at play in *Peter Schlemihl*. Interestingly, Fink twice describes the *Schlemihl* text as a confession ("la tradition" 29 & 50).

[45] Freund points out that Schlemihl's future is a product of his power of imagination (46).

---

[46] Pinsker remarks that with Heinrich Heine "the schlemiel became a metaphor of the artistic quest itself. In his *Hebrew Melodies*, he equated the term with the 'Fate of poets!'" (11-12; cf. Wisse 126).

[47] "Ich habe nur ... was da hell und vollendet im Urbild vor mein inneres Auge trat, getreu mit stillem, strengem, unausgesetztem Fleiß darzustellen gesucht, und meine Selbstzufriedenheit hat von dem Zusammenfallen des Dargestellten mit dem Urbild abgehangen" (71).

In spite of the scant physiognomical detail, Chamisso's work illuminates the study of this pseudoscience especially as it relates to the creative individual. By drawing attention to the dichotomy between the official representation of the face as a shadow and the residue of the actual face, I have shown how Chamisso criticizes the discourse of shadows for facilitating social or symbolic success by helping to cover up homosexuality and so ultimately only serve normative influences. Chamisso allows his hero to rise above hypocritical systems to show that it is possible to go it alone. Peter Schlemihl never loses face. His strange story is exactly an account of self-authorship and an attempt to conceive homosexuality not as the mere occurrence of a sexual act but more broadly as a psyche or lifestyle. The novel's closing moral counters the complicitous artist-figure's earlier advice to hide with what can be taken for a formula for honest self-assertion or for a motto for gay pride: "should you wish to live among mankind, learn to honor your shadow first and foremost, and then money. Should you wish only to live for yourself and your better part, well, then you need no advice."[49] And yet, in spite of composing what by definition must be the first German coming-out story, the poetic I Chamisso was never able to follow his own advice or the example of his Peter Schlemihl. Two often-quoted lines from Chamisso's well-known 1834 poem "An meinen alten Freund Peter Schlemihl" ("To My Old Friend Peter

---

[48] V. Hoffmann uses the expressions "intimes Bekenntnis" and "Beichte" meaning "(intimate) confession" (677).

[49] "willst du unter den Menschen leben, so lerne verehren zuvörderst den Schatten, sodann das Geld. Willst du nur dir und deinem bessern Selbst leben, oh, so brauchst du keinen Rat" (78-79).

Schlemihl") – "I possess the shadow with which I was born, / I have never lost my shadow"[50] – indicate that Chamisso neither gave in to his desires nor dared to stand outside the physiognomical discourse of shadows. He remained somewhat of a "hypocrite among people without prejudice."[51] Schlemihl lost sight of his shadow and by doing so freed himself from physiognomical restraint and self-denial. But in the opening letter of the preface the fictional Chamisso has to admit – as ought many a commentator of *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte* – that for many years he *lost sight* of the very face that revealed to him the emancipation of the self: "ich [hatte diesen Schlemihl] seit langen Jahren aus dem Gesicht verloren" (3).

---

[50] "Den Schatten hab ich, der mir angeboren, / Ich habe meinen Schatten nie verloren" (8).

[51] The expression, of course, is part of a now famous series of paradoxes used by Chamisso in a letter to Mme. de Staël in 1810 to express his frustrating predicament. The full French text reads: "Je suis Français en Allemagne et Allemand en France; catholique chez les protestants, protestant chez les catholiques; philosophe chez les gens religieux, et *cagot chez les gens sans préjugés*; homme du monde chez les savants et pédant dans le monde; Jacobin chez les aristocrates et chez les démocrates un noble, un homme de l'Ancien Régime etc. etc. etc. Je ne suis nulle part de mise, je suis partout étranger – je voudrais trop éteindre, tout m'échappe. Je suis malheureux" (Hitzig 5: 391; my emphasis).

Chapter Two

Physiognomy, Artist-Figures, and Homosocial Desire in Mörike's *Maler Nolten*

This chapter looks at physiognomy as it assists the construction of the artist-figure in the decades surrounding 1800, using Eduard Mörike's Bildungsroman *Maler Nolten* (*Nolten the Painter*, 1832) as a specific example of the general tendencies and repercussions of the knowledge generated by this pseudoscience. *Maler Nolten* is a novel that takes issue with the networking practices of the cultural community, its association of artists, patrons, and admirers. It reflects the personal development, social determination, and regulated appearance of the artist-figure. It is also a work containing both narrative descriptions of faces and interpretations of faces by the novel's characters. With these features Mörike's novel is a document of the development of physiognomy since the late eighteenth century as a theory that appropriates the face as a manifestation of an individual's virtue, intellect, and calling. Indeed, from the emergence of Johann Caspar Lavater's *Physiognomische Fragmente* from 1775 to 1778 to the publication of Mörike's novel in 1832, the face, as it materializes in the discourse of physiognomy, serves as an object of knowledge of the apparent predetermination and natural selection of all kinds of people, though particularly of the artist. I believe that the project of physiognomy is a record of social destiny or identity where that identity – in this instance, the formation of the artist – is a correlative of a certain technology of power over the face.

I.

The reader alert to the physiognomical discourse of Mörike's day will find no lack of references to the face in *Maler Nolten*. While some faces and appearances are regarded more favorably than others, they all combine to evoke the prolific theoretical and popular attention given during the period to how an individual's character and worth are revealed by appearance. For example, the protagonist Theobald Nolten is generally regarded in a positive light. He is "a well-dressed young man" and has "a very promising and remarkably pleasant physiognomy"; he is "healthy and cheery enough."[1] Likewise, Constanze, who for a time is the object of Nolten's attentions, is designated by such positive phrases as "the unpremeditated expression of [an] angel," "[the] look of the fairest face," and "the carefreeness of her mien."[2] The narrator expounds with similarly positive and more exacting detail on the nature of the Baron von Neuburg, who still displays the facial signs of his gregariousness and intellectual greatness in spite of the regrettable physical demise of his body due to the aging process. Indeed, the degree of commentary is not necessarily proportionate to the apparent importance or centrality of any particular figure, no matter the sentiment.

> He still had not done away with his unfashionably stiff collars that recalled his former military posture. But our cheeriness is retuned to an uncomfortable compassion on having to recognize that everything like this is only still the appearance of the former condition, that age and frailty contradict these remaining signs of a better time. And thus it grieved also Nolten in secret since he was observing the good man more exactly. He went about many things with more of a stoop, his wrinkled face had become significantly paler and thinner, only the benevolent friendliness of this mouth and the ingenious fire of his eyes were able to make us forget these reflections.[3]

By contrast, the gunsmith Lörmer, also known as "Stelzfuß" ("Peg-leg") because of his wooden leg, is described in more pejorative terms. He is "a broad-shouldered man with a pockmarked face ... a sharp and ... somewhat uncivilized lad. Sheer derision, the power of an imagination inclined toward all sorts of capers and pranks flashed from his little black eyes. He carried out his jokes incidentally with a dry expression and would kill the soul of the party."[4] And the barber Sigismund Wispel receives only the most negative of descriptions: "a degenerate fellow with a puny build and sickly appearance, a snippety character as thin as a rake"; "the skinny, splinter-thin Wispel"; Lörmer refers to him as "the spindly, anemic creature."[5]

---

[1] "ein wohlgekleideter junger Mann"; "eine sehr vielversprechende und auffallend angenehme Gesichtsbildung" (20); "gesund und frisch genug" (30). All translations from the German are my own unless otherwise stated.

[2] "der unbewußte Ausdruck des Engels" (33); "[der] Anblick des holdesten Gesichtes" (85); "die Sorglosigkeit ihrer Miene" (104).

[3] "noch immer hatte er die unmodisch steifen Halsbinden, die an seine frühere militärische Haltung erinnerten, nicht abgeschafft. Aber zum peinlichen Mitleiden wird unsre frohe Rührung umgestimmt, wenn man wahrnehmen muß, daß dergleichen alles nur noch der Schein des frühern Zustandes ist, daß Alter und Gebrechlichkeit diesen überbliebenen Zeichen einer bessern Zeit widersprechen. Und so betrübte auch Nolten sich im stillen, da er den guten Mann genauer betrachtete. Er ging um vieles gebückter, sein faltiges Gesicht war bedeutend blässer und schmaler geworden, nur die wohlwollende Freundlichkeit seines Mundes und das geistreiche Feuer seiner Augen konnte diese Betrachtungen vergessen machen" (297).

Some faces are scrutinized more often and to a greater analytical depth than others. Wispel has just such a face, the descriptions of which I shall return to later. Elisabeth is another such figure.[6] The second-level narrator of the supplementary story "Ein Tag aus Noltens Jugendleben" ("A Day in the Life of the Youth Nolten") written by Larkens and Theobald Nolten remarks that the young Nolten and his sister Adelheid once came across a Gypsy girl "whose strange, but in no way unpleasant appearance on first sight seemed to betray a Gypsy. The form of the face, mien, and manner had a remarkable aura of beauty and power, everything was right to instil awe, even, trust, should one pursue a certain sorrowful expression upon the face."[7] Agnes's initial reading of the Gypsy Elisabeth is also positive: "And still, as she looked again into the face of the unknown woman, she believed she discovered something indescribably great, something generating trust, even something most familiar in whose soulful sight the spirit frees itself of the burden of the present suffering, even conquers the fear of the future."[8] Likewise, Larkens describes her as "grown tall and slim; no longer so young, but still a real beauty."[9] Yet his friend Leopold almost loses his mind on encountering her physiognomy, for she is a doppelgänger of a figure in one of Nolten's paintings (193). Similarly, Theobald's Father, the Pastor Nolten – as we are told in the inserted story by Larkens and Nolten – is at a loss for words and is taken aback on first being introduced to the young Gypsy girl and observing her facial features (212). This is because she resembles the portrait of the Pastor's brother's (Friedrich Nolten's) Gypsy lover Loskine: "even the Pastor was seized against his will by the demonic beauty of the face. It really could have been taken for a portrait of Elisabeth."[10] There thus appears to be divided opinions regarding Elisabeth, perhaps signaling two distinct camps with characters such as Nolten, Adelheid, Agnes, and Larkens beginning to form a tenuous group on the one side and figures such as Leopold and Nolten's Father starting to shape another in opposition. On either side, the appearance of the strange Gypsy woman represents an unfamiliar and unexpected object whose most immediate appreciation is secured by a physiognomical response.

---

[4] "ein[] breitschultrige[r] Mann[] mit pockennarbigem Gesicht ... ein[] aufgeweckte[r] und ... etwas verwilderte[r] Bursche[]. Aus seinen kleinen schwarzen Augen blitzte die helle Spottlustigkeit, eine zu allerlei Sprüngen und Possen aufgelegte Einbildungskraft. Er trug seine Scherze übrigens mit trockener Miene vor, und machte die Seele der Gesellschaft aus" (344).

[5] "ein verwahrloster Mensch von schwächlicher Gestalt und kränklichem Aussehen, eine spindeldünne Schneiderfigur" (17); "der magere, splitterdünne Wispel" (96); "das spindeldünne bleichsüchtige Wesen" (347).

[6] The figure of Elisabeth is based on the real-life personage of Maria Meyer and a number of literary precedents including Goethe's Mignon (Berka; Graevenitz 15; Maync 72; Prawer 67; Vogelmann 457-58; cf. Storz 178-81).

[7] "deren fremdartiges, aber keineswegs unangenehmes Aussehen auf den ersten Blick eine Zigeunerin zu verraten schien. Bildung des Gesichts, Miene und Anstand hatte ein auffallendes Gepräge von Schönheit und Kraft, alles war geeignet, Ehrfurcht, ja selbst Vertrauen einzuflößen, wenn man einem gewissen kummervollen Ausdruck des Gesichts nachging" (204).

For her own part, and in addition to being able to read palms (56), "the brown girl" with "a beautifully formed hand"[11] and black eyes (204, 205) seems to possess a talent for reading faces that reveals to her what others are unable to see. Adelheid is suddenly made speechless on perceiving a startled expression on the Gypsy girl's face as she looks at Theobald (204), and the young Nolten asks the Gypsy girl whether she can read his soul as he suspects (206). But her face changes in reaction to young Nolten's expression: "Whenever Theobald's expression showed only a deeply satisfied and delighted devotion, still a faint remnant of the previous turmoil of her mind was issued forth from the [Gypsy] maiden like sheet lightning, but the transition of her look to the gentle and pleasant peace, with which she, as it were, did away with violence, was all the more charming and touching."[12] However, Elisabeth is not alone in possessing a talent for, or a need to refer to, the social custom of reading faces in order to gain insight into – or at least to give the appearance of knowing the truth about – someone's disposition. Several characters in the novel partake in some kind of physiognomical or pathognomic analysis. In addition to Elisabeth, these include Wispel (17), Tillsen's Wife (21), Theobald Nolten (30, 90, 93, 265, 288, 297, 391-92, 409), Agnes (57, 436), Larkens and Theobald Nolten as coauthors (204, 207, 212), Privy Councillor (Hofrat) Friedrich Nolten (217-18, 233, 266), Governess Frau von Niethelm (271), Baron von Neuburg (297), President von K. (363-64), and, of course, the narrator (9, 30, 85, 104, 157, 170, 264, 266, 344, 373, 379, 414, 436, 444). It is thus evident that the practice of analyzing the face as a means of assuming knowledge of other people is widespread among the community cast in Mörike's *Maler Nolten*. Indeed, many of the characters of the novel would surely be even more uncertain about those about them if they did not have recourse to physiognomy. The rubric of this pseudoscience constitutes a convenient technological means for the figures populating the novel to make sense of the nature and position of others in regard to their own.

---

[8] "Und doch, indem sie aufs neue in das Gesicht der Unbekannten sah, glaubte sie etwas unbeschreiblich Hohes, Vertrauenerweckendes, ja Längstbekanntes zu entdecken, in dessen seelenvollem Anblicke der Geist sich von der Last des gegenwärtigen Schmerzens befreie, ja selbst die Angst der Zukunft überwinde" (57).

[9] "hoch, schlank gewachsen; nicht mehr ganz jung, aber immer noch eine wirkliche Schönheit" (194).

[10] "selbst der Pfarrer ward wider Willen von der dämonischen Schönheit des Gesichtes festgehalten; man hätte es wirklich für ein Portrait Elisabeths halten können" (228).

[11] "das braune Mädchen ... eine schöngebildete braune Hand" (206).

As the numerous instances amply demonstrate, Mörike's text exhibits a proficient familiarity with the popular social (and literary) trend of decoding the meaning of faces. Such a consideration of physiognomy is primarily grounded in the references – either direct, subtle, or ironic – to some of its more familiar proponents and commentators in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, as well as in the allusions to its manner and materials. The text features such devices as silhouettes (105, 426) and the magic lantern (108, 161, 168, 178), both favored by physiognomists to create their representations of the human head and face. It also makes direct mention of painter, engraver, and cartoonist William Hogarth (233), critic Georg Christoph Lichtenberg (302), and playwright Ludwig Tieck (369) as arbiters of physiognomical perceptions, and there are a number of short excursuses that appear to point ironically at the type of pronouncements made by such physiognomical dignitaries as Charles Le Brun and Johann Caspar Lavater.[13]

---

[12] "Wenn die Miene Theobalds nur eine tiefbefriedigte, entzückte Hingebung ausdrückte, so brach zwar aus der Jungfrau noch ein matter Rest des vorigen Aufruhrs ihrer Sinne wie Wetterleuchten hervor, aber um so reizender und rührender war der Übergang ihres Blickes zur sanften, gefälligen Ruhe, wozu sie sich gleichsam Gewalt antat" (207).

Surely, it is quite feasible that Mörike had not only Novalis's *Ursprache* in mind when composing Baron von Neuburg's part of the *Kunstgespräch* with Nolten and Agnes's Father, the Forest Warden. Though the Baron mentions the Romantic poet by name – while at once distancing himself from Novalis's poetic theories with the remark that "[Novalis], by the way, does not make me entirely happy"[14] – his words regarding the destiny and personal development of the artist (and what distinguishes *him* from the philistine) also distinctly evoke the physiognomical semiology of Lavater's concept of the human face as divine language:[15]

> "I cannot imagine it [to be] charming and touching enough: the quiet, subdued light in which the lad then still envisages the world, where one is inclined to impress upon the commonest objects a strange and often uncanny stamp, and to attach a secret to them, only so that they signify something to that imagination in which behind every visible thing, be whatever it may – a piece of wood, a stone, or the weathercock on the steeple – [there hides] something invisible, [and] behind every dead thing there hides something spiritual, which devoutly and secludedly fosters its own life concealed in itself, *where everything [has] expression, where everything takes on a physiognomy*." (My emphasis.)[16]

---

[13] See Tscherpel on the affect on *Maler Nolten* of Lavater, physiognomy, and pathognomy (36, 38-42, 76-77, 79, 81, 95, 98, 101 [n53], 128-29, 132, 152), as well as of Marin Cureau de la Chambre (38), Giovanni Battista della Porta (77), Hogarth (37, 70-80, 98-99, 121, 145, 156-59, 173), Le Brun (38, 128), Lichtenberg (79, 102), and Tieck (101 [n 53], 134). Maync includes Lavater on Mörike's reading list for 1832 (132).

[14] "der mir übrigens nicht ganz wohl macht" (303).

[15] On Novalis and physiognomical semiotics or Lavater, see Böhme (172-78); Saltzwedel (291-316); Stadler.

[16] "Ich kann es mir nicht reizend und rührend genug vorstellen, das stille gedämpfte Licht, worin dem Knaben dann die Welt noch schwebt, wo man geneigt ist, den gewöhnlichsten Gegenständen ein fremdes, oft unheimliches Gepräge aufzudrücken, und ein Geheimnis damit zu verbinden, nur damit sie der Phantasie etwas bedeuten, wo hinter jedem sichtbaren Dinge, es sei dies, was es wolle – ein Holz, ein Stein, oder der Hahn und Knopf auf dem Turme – ein Unsichtbares, hinter jeder toten Sache ein geistig etwas steckt, das sein eignes, in sich verborgenes Leben andächtig abgeschlossen hegt, *wo alles Ausdruck, alles Physiognomie annimmt*"

This passage follows an earlier meditation by Nolten concerning Constanze's beauty that also suggests a certain familiarity with Lavater's convictions: "Is not everything that stirs and moves about her *the unpremeditated expression of the angel* that breathes in her?" (my emphasis).[17]

Though again a precedent may very well have been set by Novalis's *blaue Blume* in his novel *Heinrich von Ofterdingen* (and by extension by the tiger lilies in E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Der goldne Topf*), a similar incidence of the influence of the then pervasive reception of Lavater's theories of the face occurs when Nolten again reflects upon Constanze's beauty. This time the young man adds support to his affection by projecting Constanze's image figuratively via poetic musings onto the physiognomy of a plant:

> Thus stood on a narrow mahogany column against the wall an open calla lily in a brightly painted pot bearing the golden letter C. on a blue shield. This plant, he thought to himself, do I not imagine it to be part of Constanze's own being? Yes, this glorious chalice that releases from its snowy depth the mildest spirits, these dark leaves that spread out protectively and protectedly under the quiet sanctuary of the flower, how beautifully all of this illustrates my sweetheart and all that surrounds her! how this plant by its ominous presence seems to me to take the place of her heavenly figure![18]

Particularly compelling in respect to the referencing of the proponents and pronouncements of physiognomy is the comparison of another passage from *Maler Nolten* with a specific interpretation by Lavater. Toward the beginning of the second part of Mörike's "Novella in Two Parts," the Privy Councillor comments to Leopold about the

---

(300; my emphasis).

[17] "Ist nicht alles, was an ihr sich regt und bewegt, *der unbewußte Ausdruck des Engels*, der in ihr atmet?" (33; my emphasis).

[18] "So stand auf einem schmalen Mahagonipfeiler an der Wand eine offene Kalla in buntgemaltem Topfe, der den goldenen Buchstaben C. im blauen Schilde trug. Diese Pflanze, dachte er bei sich, nimmt sie nicht in meiner Einbildung einen Teil von Constanzens eigenem Wesen an? Ja, dieser herrliche Kelch, der aus seiner schneeigen Tiefe die mildesten Geister entläßt, diese dunkeln Blätter, die sich schützend und geschützt unter das stille Heiligtum der Blume breiten, wie schön wird durch das alles die Geliebte bezeichnet und was sie umgibt! wie vertritt die Pflanze mir durch ihre ahnungsvolle Gegenwart die himmlische Gestalt!" (76-77).

bearing of a tame starling. Doing so, he speaks ironically, offering a veiled allusion to poet figures via the nightingale (philomel) evoked by the mention of the Greek princess Philomela. He assesses the bird (quite possibly a metaphor for Larkens) in the following manner:

> “Take another look at that lad up there! Notice the philosophical clarity, the fine sarcasm, with which this beak pecks out at the world! If we were now perhaps to imagine a monument, a gravestone, under the pyramid of the well, it would be without doubt more in accordance with elegiac taste to think of Philomela, the sweet songstress of melancholy and love, in the dangling branches of the willow, than [to think] of the most educated starling, whose mere figure already reveals far too much of the man of the world. Meanwhile, it seems to me, a tomfool, sitting deep in thought on a sarcophagus, wouldn't be such a rotten idea either. A topic for a Hogarth, perhaps. The rapscallion could have a sleeping child on his lap, and behind his back a steely-gray old man with a stick, half in a rage, half laughing, would be eavesdropping on [the fool's] peculiar conversation with himself. The idiot's face would have to show how much of an effort it was for him to appear quite profound and serious; but he doesn't succeed, and each time he shakes his head most meaningfully he is accompanied by [the jingling of] his fool's cap. What do you think then? The winged rascal up there, who had the misfortune yesterday, I know not how or where, of falling into a pot of yellow oil paint, the traces of which he still bears – is he not the spitting image of a spotted common satirist? Isn't he an incomparable lad?”[19]

---

[19] “Widmen Sie doch dem Burschen da droben noch einen Blick! Bemerken Sie die philosophische Klarheit, den feinen Sarkasmus, womit dieser Schnabel in die Welt hinaussticht! Stellen wir uns nun etwa unter der Brunnenpyramide ein Monument, ein Grabmal vor, so wäre es dem elegischen Geschmack ohne Zweifel gemäßer, in den hängenden Weidenzweigen sich Philomelen, die süße Sängerin der Wehmut und der Liebe, zu denken, als den gebildetsten Staren, dessen bloße Figur schon viel zu viel vom Weltmann hat. Indessen, dünkt mich, wäre ein Hanswurst, gedankenvoll auf einem Sarkophagen sitzend, eine so üble Vorstellung auch nicht, vielleicht ein Gegenstand für einen Hogarth. Man gäbe dem Kujon etwa ein schlafendes Kind auf den Schoß und hinter seinem Rücken würde, halb zürnend halb lächelnd, ein eisgrauer Alter am Stabe das sonderbare Selbstgepräch belauschen. Des Narren Gesicht müßte zeigen, wie er sich Mühe gibt, recht tiefsinnig und ernsthaft zu sein; aber es geht nicht, und das bedeutendste Kopfschütteln wird jedesmal von der Schellenkappe begleitet. Was meinen Sie nun? der geflügelte Schlingel dort, welcher gestern das Unglück

Not only does the Privy Councillor make direct mention of the English painter and engraver Hogarth, but his physiognomical assessment of the starling also bears a striking, if mocking, resemblance to one of Lavater's interpretations in his commentary on birds (see also Tscherpel 76-80). Here, Lavater expounds with great sincerity on the outwardly visible signs of the virtues of the eagle:

> How rectangular, if not acute, is [the angle that the middle line of the beak forms with the eye] in the eagle ... In this, also, the royal bird more resembles the monarch of the earth, notwithstanding their otherwise infinite difference, than all the rest of the feathered species ... Who can behold this firm-built bird, hovering in the air, this powerful lord of so many creatures, without perceiving the seal, the native star of royalty in his piercing round eye, the form of his head, his strong wings, his talons of brass; and in his whole form, his victorious strength, his contemptuous arrogance, his fearful cruelty, and his ravenous propensity? Consider the eyes of all living creatures, from the eagle to the mole; where else can be found that lightning glance that defies the rays of the sun? Where that capacity for the reception of light? – Where! – How truly, how emphatically, to all who will hear and understand, is the majesty of his kingly character visible; not alone in his burning eye, but in the outline of what is analogous to the eye-bone, and in the skin of his head, where anger and courage are seated! But throughout his whole form, where are they not? (*Essays* 223-24)[20]

---

gehabt, ich weiß weder wo noch wie, in einen Topf mit gelber Ölfarbe zu fallen, davon er die Spuren noch trägt – gleicht er denn nicht aufs Haar so einem buntscheckigen Allerweltsspötter? Ist es nicht ein unvergleichlicher Junge?'" (233-34).

[20] Holcroft's translation deviates somewhat from the original German: "Der hellen wolkenlosen Sonne kühn entgegen hebe sich der majestätische Adler, schaut weit umher in unermeßliche Gegenden, und entdeckt in der Tiefe seinen lebendigen Raub – auf der Erde, oder auf einem Baum, oder in der Luft schwebend – stürzt sich herab, ergreift ihn mit gewaltiger Klaue, und trägt ihn auf einsame Felsen, oder in Thäler mit stolzer Kraft, ihn noch vollends zu zerreissen und zu verschlingen!

Wer kann ihn anschauen, ohne diese Stärke, diese siegreiche Schnellkraft, diesen stolzen Grimm, diesen furchtbaren Räuber – in seiner äussern Gestalt zu einblicken! wie funkelt sein Aug! – Ist's nicht wie der Blick des Blitzes! wer vertraut sich so stolz der blendenden Sonnenflamme! Betrachte alle Augen bis zu des Maulwurfs herab – wo findest du diese durchdringende blitzende Festigkeit des schnell sich wälzenden Blickes! wo dieß Verhältniß der Augen zum Lichte – wo? – O wie wahr, wie laut spricht die Natur zu dem, der Ohren hat.

A further potential, and more satirical, allusion to the kind of physiognomical reflections associated with Lavater occurs in *Maler Nolten* on the excursion to Halmedorf.[21] Here, the loquacious Amandus conducts an analysis of the two kinds of women according to the different ways in which they sigh.

> "The one [kind of sigh] is quite often of a material nature. No breeze is capable of lifting it from the rosy lip and blissfully carrying it off across splendid surroundings. Rather, it immediately falls awkwardly and heavily to the ground, prosaic like the handkerchief with which one mops one's brow. Properly, the fair sex should abstain from this [kind of sigh], [or] at least suppress it, because to some extent it must offend the host, the guide of a party of sightseers, who enthusiastically presents all this magnificence as his property and cannot grasp how at such moments anyone can possess only the least feeling of the pathetic effort needed to buy oneself such a sight. Yes, I have seen ladies who have taken the trouble to utter this sigh in a quite charmingly consumptive and ethereal way, and to make a face imploring sympathy, as if a faint were about to come. At this one hardly refrains from asking quite longingly: Wouldn't you care for a sip of Affenthaler, Miss, or something like it?"[22]

Aber nicht nur Glut des blitzenden Adlerauges spricht innere Wahrheit, auch der obere Umriß, auch die übergewälzte Stirnhaut – zeigt seinen Zorn, und seinen Muth.

Die Vorgebogenheit, die Kürze, die Schiefe, die Gewölbtheit, die Festigkeit seines obern Schnabels – sind dieß nicht alles redende Zeichen des Muths und der Stärke? ...

Goldadler.

Nach Natur und durch Alter schwächere Urkraft – feuriger Blick, aber nicht rachdrohend, nicht tief; alles kraftloser, scheuer, weiblicher, als 1. 2. 6. der vorhergehenden Tafel – besonders die Höhlung über dem verdeckten Nasenloche, wie der Umriß des obern und untern Schnabels." (2: 205 & 207).

[21] Yet another example of an allusion to physiognomical discourse is the "double-physiognomy" of President von K.'s castle, which is analyzed by Tscherpel as a mix of old and new styles or classicistic and romantic elements and therefore a criticism by Mörike of the narrow power positions of aesthetic discourse (151-52).

[22] "'Der eine ist ganz gemein materieller Natur, kein Lüftchen ist imstand, ihn von der Rosenlippe aufzunehmen und über die glänzende Gegend selig hinwegzutragen, sondern sogleich fällt er plump, schwer zu Boden, prosaisch wie das Schnupftuch, womit man sich die Stirn abtrocknet. Billig sollten die Schönen sich seiner ganz enthalten, ihn wenigstens unterdrücken, denn gewissermaßen muß er den Wirt beleidigen, den Cicerone der Gesellschaft, der alle diese Herrlichkeit mit Enthusiasmus wie sein Eigentum vorzeigt und nicht begreifen kann, wie man in solchen Augenblicke nur noch das mindeste Gefühl von der armseligen Mühe haben kann, womit man sich so einen Anblick erkaufte. Ja, Damen hab ich gesehen, die gaben sich Mühe, diesen Seufzer recht reizend schwindsüchtig und ätherisch hervorzubringen und ein mitleidflehendes Gesicht zu machen, als würde gleich die Ohnmacht kommen. Man enthält sich kaum dabei recht schmachtend zu

This lecture, already absurd in its reductionist approach to women, is made still more comical by the timely appearance of Agnes carrying a child whom she sets down on the ground *with a sigh* as if to corroborate Amandus's remarks. His theory of analyzing women according to the way they sigh evokes the often weird and wonderful assertions of such esoteric sciences or psychomantic fads as astrology, palmistry, and, even, physiognomy. Since Amandus is a pastor by profession, the text's ironic treatment of his sermon on the nature of women can be considered as an instance of poking fun at the ignorance of his fellow real-life clergyman and fortuneteller, Lavater (or at the author's own inclusion of physiognomical customs in his novel, since Mörike was a pastor too). When analyzing women according to their faces, Lavater prefaces his remarks with the confession that he is "but little acquainted with the female part of the human race," that his "opportunities of seeing them ... have been exceedingly few," and that as a young man he "almost avoided women, and was never in love" (*Essays* 396).[23] (Mörike is also not known particularly for seeking out deep relationships with women, a point I will return to below.)

However, Mörike's novel does not cite or suggest physiognomical practices in order to pay homage to its advocates or merely to amuse, albeit in different ways, either its enthusiasts or its detractors. Rather, the text demonstrates a critical dialogue with the social function of the face and, consequently, the body of knowledgeable works comprising and regulating its discursive practices (cf. Tscherpel 38-39). The very first reference, on the very first page of the novel, to the nature of one of its characters' faces immediately pertains to – perhaps alerts the reader's attention to – the potential deceptions involved in accruing knowledge by regarding the face. The narrator explains that the artist Tillsen knows how to hide his annoyance (regarding his involvement with an apparent sketch artist and imposter Wispel) and discomfort from Baron Jaßfeld: "At these words a trace of frustration and

---

fragen: Ist Ihnen nicht ein Schluck Affenthaler gefällig, Fräulein, oder dergleichen?'" (315-16). "Affenthaler" is a dry red *Spätburgunder* ("late vintage burgundy wine") from Baden.

[23] "Ich weiß sehr wenig über die weibliche Hälfte des menschlichen Geschlechts ... Ich habe äußerst selten Anlaß gehabt, weibliche Geschöpfe zu kennen ... In meinen frühern Jahren war ich beynahe Weiberscheu – und ich war nie – *verliebt*" (*Physiognomische Fragmente*, Reclam Edition 259).

embarrassment showed itself on the painter's face, but he knew how to conceal it quickly."[24] Some doubt may be cast on the extent to which Tillsen is successful with his initial polite duplicity when a few pages later, in the text's second reference to the face, Tillsen admits to his brother-in-law Major von R. that the presumed sketch artist (Wispel) – whom he has just described as "a degenerate fellow with a puny build and sickly appearance, a snippety character as thin as a rake" – seemed (nonetheless) to be able to read through another more cunning deception regarding the quality of some sample sketches: "I intentionally concealed my approval in order first to question my man to convince myself whether all this were not perhaps someone else's property. He seemed to notice my mistrust and gave an offended smile."[25] Since they point to the face as a somewhat unreliable social performance, these first examples already begin to raise the contending issues of the integrity and overall efficiency of making use of the face as an object of knowledge. They thus draw attention to the need to examine the motivation in a certain social circle for continuing to rely on physiognomical evaluations in light of, or in spite of, their ethical and practical shortcomings. The fact that Mörike links physiognomy with the estimation of one *potential artist* and his artwork by another *recognized artist* is not insignificant. Indeed, out of all groups in society it is artists who appear to be most enmeshed in and to have the most power and influence to gain from the fabrication and implementation of physiognomical learning since this discourse is, first and foremost, specifically concerned with the ranks of artists.

II.

It is from the work of Lavater in particular that one learns that the faces of cultural producers, such as painters, sculptors, musicians, and poets, must look – as is the case with all respective groups in society – in a particular way, a way that is distinct to the qualities of that group and specifically concurs their social function; according to Lavater, the genuine artist or intellectual is knowable by the outward appearance of *his* face. When conducting a comparative analysis of "Four Sketches of Italian Artists. Ghiberti, Lombardo, da Vinci, Ferrucci," Lavater remarks "Should I know nothing, not the least about these four faces – would it be possible not to discover the character of all four? ... All four are remarkably physiognomical."[26] The discussion of the physiognomy of these exemplary painters and sculptors continues as follows:

---

[24] "Bei diesen Worten zeigte sich eine Spur von Verdruß und Verlegenheit auf des Malers Gesicht; er wußte sie jedoch schnell zu verbergen" (9).

[25] "ein verwahrloster Mensch von schwächlicher Gestalt und kränklichem Aussehen, eine spindeldünne Schneiderfigur"; "Ich verbarg meinen Beifall absichtlich, um meinen Mann erst auszuforschen, mich zu überzeugen, ob das alles nicht etwa fremdes Gut wäre. Er schien mein Mißtrauen zu bemerken und lächelte beleidigt" (17).

> *Ghiberti's* eye is the best, the most seeing, the most thinking; *Lombardo's* the noblest; he is overall more thinking, more deeply penetrating, than the previous – *Da Vinci's* the most accurate, the steadiest; *Ferrucci's* the most replete with genius and most malicious ... Notice here also four [different] degrees of [the] brow; brows of Strength and Creation. The *first* – the most turned up and the most expressive – certainly the supplest and richest in imagination. The *second* stronger and more sensible, already straighter. The *third* more perpendicular – greater sense of stiffness, defiance, iron. The *fourth* almost just as straight, but much more reclining. Less stubbornness than [*da Vinci*], but maliciousness ... The noses of all four are extremely significant ... *Ghiberti's* the most reason; *Lombardo's* more taste; *da Vinci's* both together to a great degree; *Ferrucci's* the most boldness and pride ... *Ghiberti's* physiognomy ... on the whole, the richest in taste; *Lombardo's* the noblest; *da Vinci's* the greatest; *Ferrucci's* the rawest, most forceful, most productive and most terrible.[27]

---

[26] "Wenn ich nichts, nicht das mindeste von diesen vier Gesichtern wüßte – wär's möglich, nicht auf den Charakter von allen vieren zu treffen? ... Alle vier Gesichter sind auffallend physiognomisch" (218).

[27] "*Ghibertis* Aug' ist das beste, das sehendste, das denkendste; *Lombardis* das edelste; er überhaupt denkender, tieferdringend, als der vorige – *Da Vincis* das treffendste, festeste; *Ferruccis* das Genievollste und boshafteste ... Sehet hier auch vier Stufen von Stirnen; Kraft- und Schöpfungsstirnen. Die *erste* – die gebogenste und redenste – gewiß die biegsamste und Imaginationsreichste. Die *zweyte* kräftiger und verständiger; schon geradlinigter. Die *dritte* perpendikularer – mehr Steifsinn, Trotzsinn, Eisensinn. Die *vierte* beynah eben so geradlinigt, aber viel liegender. Weniger Starrsinn als [*da Vinci*], aber Bosheit ... Die Nasen von allen vieren äußerst signifikatif ... *Ghibertis* am meisten Verstand; *Lombardis* mehr Geschmack; *da Vincis* beydes zusammen in hohem Grade; *Ferruccis* am meisten Kühnheit und Stolz ... *Ghibertis* Physiognomie ... im *Ganzen*, die Geschmackreichste; *Lombardis* die edelste; *da Vincis* die größte; *Ferruccis* die roheste, gewaltsamste, frucht- und furchtbarste" (221).

In Lavater's scheme, the greatness of these four artists is plain to see from the quality of the airs instilled in their collective physiognomies. Although the sketches of these artists' faces do resemble one another to a degree, the detailed elements of their outward appearances are not the result of the exact measurement of naturally reoccurring facial structures unique in their combination to the class of artists per se. Rather, Lavater's defining remarks are, on the one hand, and in the very least, the projection of personal preferences on his part concerning the artwork of these individuals and, on the other hand, and more significantly, the effect of the observation of preconceived notions of the general role and rank of artists in the overall order of human society. Indeed, the features of an artist's face are insignificant unless they are at once read as the physical emanation of the social function of the artist as far as Lavater, his compeers, and his contemporaries are concerned. According to Lavater, the artist imitates and reproduces god's work (see *Essays* 172). Furthermore, the artist's work is a sourcebook for physiognomists[28] who are charged with reading the material impressions of divine language. In fact, the artist must take all due care and attention when working with his subject-matter since his role is pivotal in the process of faithfully disseminating god's message. Lavater insists that "Sacred to [the portrait painter] should be the living countenance as the text of holy scripture to the translator. As careful should the one be not to falsify the work, as should the other not to falsify the word of God" (*Essays* 171). An artist is an impersonator of faces whose renditions must be true to their original divine plan. And as for the artist's own face, Lavater must consider it a signifier to which the signified of 'divine translator, disseminator, and imitator of the truth or gospel' is added. It is in this way that the sign of *the apostolic face of the great artist* is established.

Ellis Shookman remarks not only that "Lavater thought that art showed the physiognomy of artists," but that "He even criticizes some for their tendency to project their own facial features into their portraits of others" ("Pseudo-Science" 19). But I contend that it is only by observing the attributes of portraits and sculptures by artists and tracing a correlation back from these figures to the artists' faces themselves that Lavater is able to comment on and assess the individual physiognomical standing of particular artists. That is, from Lavater's perspective, an artist's own features, themselves products of a divine plan, are projected into his artwork; the qualities of the artwork reflect the qualities already existent upon the artist's face; the artist's face can be analyzed in the very terms of the subject-matter of the artist's work, namely, the degree to which, in Lavater's opinion, the artist succeeds in emulating god's work. For example, remarks made by Lavater concerning Michelangelo Buonarotti's appearance, intended to appraise his status among artists, are evidently as much the effect of the physiognomist's familiarity with and appreciation of the Renaissance artist's work – or at least its reception – as they are the result of an interpretative assessment of Michelangelo's facial features: "His entire face is a lion's face. Is it just poetry, enthusiasm, mere rhetoric once again, when I say: such a face cannot [invent or draw] in a sublime way – [can] neither invent nor draw noble figures, as [can] Raphael ... It is true; give it whichever name you want. Fire – wealth, courage, power, enthusiasm – *is in this face, and is in the products of this face* – But sublimity, nobility, purity, chastity, when I may use this expression – *are neither in this face nor in its works*" (my emphasis).[29] Lavater thus exacts the facial register of the artist by supposedly rediscovering upon the face the origins of what he perceives to be either the extent or lack of certain qualities found in that same artist's product. The more sublime the nature or execution of an artist's work, from Lavater's perspective, the closer the artist comes to taking on both a sacred appearance and an exalted position. On reinspecting Lavater's four favored Italians, it is notable that not only have they all inherited *brows of creation*, but Lombardo's face, in particular, is "at best not entirely unworthy of *an apostle*" (my emphasis).[30] The transparency of these faces with the perceived social function of artists enables their physiognomical taxonomy and, consequently, the knowledge of their relative importance. Since the high office of the holy is taken for granted, it is by way of the sublime appearance of great artists that one may know also their distinguished social rank. The fact that the appearance of the presumed sketch artist (Wispel) in the opening scene of Mörike's *Maler Nolten* is more ragged and unhealthy than sublime is, in light of the prevalent discourse instructed by Lavater's pronouncements on the proximity between the nature of artists' faces and the nature of their calling, surely reason enough for a distinguished art figure as Tillsen to doubt the honesty of the stranger's claims to be the originator of such promising work.

---

[28] Lavater discusses the relevance of certain artists' portraits or studies to the physiognomist throughout his work but particularly in his "First letter on the Study of Physiognomy, Addressed to Count Thun, at Vienna" (*Essays* 136-155, esp. 152-55).

---

[29] "Das Ganze ist ein Löwengesicht. Ist's nun auch wieder Poesie, Enthusiasmus, Deklamation, wenn ich sage – so ein Gesicht kann nicht erhaben – edle Figuren, wie Raphael, weder erfinden noch zeichnen ... Es ist wahr; heiße man's nun, wie man will. Feuer – Reichtum, Muth, Kraft, Begeisterung – hat das Gesicht, und haben die Produkte dieses Gesichtes – Aber Erhabenheit, Adel, Reinheit, Keuschheit, wenn mir dieser Ausdruck erlaubt ist – hat weder dieß Gesicht, noch haben seine Arbeiten" (214-15).

[30] "und allenfalls eines Apostels nicht ganz unwürdig" (218, 221).

In Lavater's essays on physiognomy, the faces of painters do not appear separately from those of other cultural producers or educated professionals. Rather, they are rendered all the more discernible by being arranged as one category in a series of measured, ordered physiognomical tables. Lavater's understanding of the great artists' cryptoreligious function as copiers of divine truth postulates a familiarity among artists with heavenly language that places them within the same general order as other prodigious cultural producers such as musicians, poets, and, of course, physiognomists. The composer is "a creator! ... an original!"[31] And "The poet is at once a painter and a musician, and more than both together"; he is the "prophet of divine creation and providence; the mediator between nature and the sons and daughters of nature."[32] Lavater offers the figures of Raphael (Raffaello Sanzio), Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, and Johann Wolfgang von Goethe as the respective epitomes of painterly, musical, and poetic genius. Not only does Lavater argue that there is "most of all in [the works of] Raphael, simplicity, greatness of conception, tranquil superiority, sublimity the most exalted" (*Essays* 154) but he asserts that "the physiognomy of genius [would measure] like Raphael" (40). Bach's face "is a type that will always flirt with and represent something in the world. A spiritual expression of his productive power seems to hover between the eyebrows, in the look of the eyes" (222).[33] In his fragment on "Poets," Lavater includes a subsection on "Göthe" in order to discuss five sketches intended to arrest the writer's physical genius: "A masculine profile with loose hair. W. G."; "Caricature. G."; "Profile with tied hair. G."; "Goethe"; and "Genius."[34] In spite of all the faults with the different reproductions of Goethe's face that Lavater is keen to indicate, the physiognomist is still able to find the traces of the poet's genius:

---

[31] Here particularly Emanuel Bach: "Er ist Schöpfer ... Er ist Original!" (222).

[32] "Der *Dichter* ist *Mahler* und *Musiker* zugleich, und mehr als beyde zusammen" (225); "*Prophet der Schöpfung und der Fürsehung Gottes. Mittler zwischen der Natur und den Söhnen und Töchtern der Natur*" (227).

> What simplicity and greatness in this face! – Across the forehead down to the eyebrow, [a] more lucid, more correct, [and] quicker reason ... The eye here has traces of the powerful genius only still in the upper eyelid ... the nose is the very expression of productivity, taste, and love, that is, of poetry ... How much boldness, strength, [and] ease overall! How youth and man melt here into one! How gentle, how without all hardness, stiffness, tension, [or] looseness; how relaxed and harmoniously the outline of the profile rolls from the uppermost point on the forehead down to where the neck loses itself in clothing! How reason here is always warm from feeling [and] feeling clear from reason ... One observes especially the *position* and *form* of this warm forehead – certainly rich in memory and thought – [One] observes the amorous, gently curved, not very deep-set, bright, effortlessly agile eye that penetrates with one quick [and] wide-ranging look – the eyebrow creeping over it so gently – this in and of itself so poetic nose – this actually so poetic transition to the full-lipped mouth – that gently trembles, as it were, from hasty feeling, and restrains the hovering trembling – this manly chin – this open, pithy ear – Who can deny this face ... the high-floating genius of a poet.[35]

---

[33] "ist eine Gattung, die immer in der Welt etwas poußiren und vorstellen wird. Zwischen den Augenbraunen, im Blicke der Augen – scheint ein geistiger Ausdruck seiner produktifen Kraft zu schweben" (222).

[34] "Ein männliches Profil mit offenen Haaren. W. G."; "Carrikatur. G."; "Ein Profil mit gebundenen Haaren. G."; "Göthe"; and "Genie" (235-43).

[35] "welche Einfachheit und Großheit in diesem Gesichte! – In der Stirne bis zur Augenbraune heller, richtiger, schneller Verstand ... Das Auge hier hat bloß noch im obern Augenliede Spuren des kraftvollen Genius ... Die Nase – voll Ausdruck von Produktifität – Geschmack und Liebe – Das heißt von Poesie" (235); "Wie viel Kühnheit, Festigkeit, Leichtigkeit im Ganzen! Wie schmilzt da Jüngling und Mann in Eins! Wie

With such combinations of expressions as *Einfachheit* (simplicity), *Großheit* (greatness), *Kühnheit* (boldness), *Festigkeit* (strength), *Leichtigkeit* (ease), with such a notion as youth and man melting into one, with the appeal to both reason and feeling, with the description of the profile and facial features accented by a sense of indeterminacy, fluid motion, and suspension (neither tense nor loose, rolling, gently curved, effortless agility, creeping, trembling, hovering, floating), and with all anchored by a masculine chin and an enlightened ear, Lavater's portrait of Goethe, the ultimate physiognomy and cultural producer,[36] conjures up an image most strikingly reminiscent both of the aesthetic vocabulary and of the art-historical tenets of Johann Joachim Winckelmann's *Gedancken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst* (*Reflections Concerning the Imitation of Greek Painting and Sculpture*, 1755) and *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* (*History of Ancient Art*, 1763) (see also Tytler 51-52; cf. 70).[37] In fact, Winckelmann takes much of the credit not only for the poetic style of the aesthetic and art-historical terminology later proliferated by German classicism, but also for extending the attention to exact detail – frequent among natural historians such as Johann Jacob Scheuchzer, August Johann Rösel von Rosenhof, and Martin Frobène Ledermüller – to the

---

sanft, wie ohn' alle Härte, Steifheit, Gespanntheit, Lockerheit; wie unangestrengt und harmonisch wälzt sich der Umriß des Profils vom obersten Stirnpunkte herab bis wo sich der Hals in die Kleidung verliert! Wie ist drinn der Verstand immer warm von Empfindung – Lichthell die Empfindung vom Verstande ... Man bemerke vorzüglich die *Lage* und *Form* dieser – nun gewiß – gedächtnißreichen, gedankenreichen – warmen Stirne – bemerke das mit Einem fortgehenden Schnellblicke durchdringende, verliebte – sanft geschweifte, nicht sehr tiefliegende, helle, leicht bewegliche Auge – die so sanft sich drüber hinschleichende Augenbraune – diese an sich allein so dichterische Nase – diesen so eigentlich poetischen Uebergang zum lippichten – von schneller Empfindung gleichsam sanft zitternden, und das schwebende Zittern zurückhaltenden Munde – dieß männliche Kinn – dieß offne, markige Ohr – Wer ist – der absprechen könne diesem Gesichte" (242); "die dichterische hochaufschwebende Genialität" (242).

[36] Lavater remarks upon a German poet whom one may presume to be Goethe: "If he had been nothing as a poet, what a valuable addition to physiognomy!" "Wär' er nichts als *Dichter*, welche Gewinnste für die Physiognomik!" (227). This quotation may appear contradictory – and certainly the original German is ambiguous – but I read this sentence with the meaning that if Goethe had not pursued a career in poetry, then – as his face attests – he could have become a physiognomist. At the end of the section "Physiognomical Exercises for Testing Physiognomical Genius," the reader arrives at a "faithful silhouette" of an anonymous, though identifiable Goethe, "one of the greatest and richest geniuses" Lavater had ever seen. "Der getreue Umriß von einem der größten und reichsten Genies, die ich in meinem Leben gesehen" (127).

[37] For a discussion of Winckelmann's "Contours of Indeterminacy," see MacLeod, "The 'Third Sex'" (esp. 198-203). See also Richter, *Laocoon's Body* (55).

structure of the human face and its various parts, the shape of limbs, the system of muscles, and the folds and lines of clothing (Curtius 16-17; see also Richter, *Laocoon's Body* 38-61). But Winckelmann and Lavater are also linked in a more art-historical way through their mutual acquaintance of Johann Heinrich Füssli, who as an apprentice artist had been guided through Rome by the German, and who as a close friend and compatriot contributed many sketches to the Swiss's physiognomical collection. Lavater's interest in obtaining a copy of Winckelmann's work was recorded by Leonhard Usteri on the envelope of a letter he had received from Winckelmann in 1763 (Rehm, [Explanation to Letter No. 603,] *Winckelmann. Briefe* 2: 513). The physiognomist also included a version of the art historian's original portrait by the painter Giovanni Battista Casanova in the fourth volume of the *Fragments* (See Rehm, [Explanation to Letters Nos. 545 & 574,] *Winckelmann. Briefe* 2: 489 & 502.), and he relies largely on Winckelmann for the interpretation of eyes (Tytler 52). Even the Swiss's rating the relative artistic merits of Raphael's work over Michelangelo's has to be accredited to the German art historian, who considered Raphael a Renaissance Athenian, disliked the Dutch and Flemish painters, and found Michelangelo "unbearable" (Biedrzynski 42). Quite simply, the aesthetic contours of Lavater's physiognomical work that affected the physical conceptions of all ranks and professions of people – including the artists and would-be artists of Mörike's novel – are directly shaped by Winckelmann's art criticism. Certainly, Lavater's explanation of Goethe's physiognomy contains much of the *edle Einfalt und stille Größe* ("noble simplicity and quiet grandeur") that Winckelmann discovers in his descriptions of such classical sculptures as the Belvedere Apollo, the Belvedere Hercules, and Laocoön, and that came to form the very physical foundations of a male aesthetic ideal that is still prevalent today (cf. MacLeod, "Floating Heads" 75-76). In fact, Lavater's description of Goethe pinpoints the moment in German-language cultural history when the burgeoning trajectories of the ideal representation of man or manliness and the ideal figure of the artist or intellectual converge in order to complement one another so that the physical potency of one may support the symbolic authority of the other, and vice versa. The effect of this convergence – the manly standard of genius – will have an inhibitive affect on the reception, selection, and recognition of those vying to become artists or cultural figures that will last well into the twentieth century. It also informs the physiognomical relations and assessments in Mörike's *Maler Nolten*.

III.

Thus far I have shown how Lavater – influenced by Winckelmann's aesthetics – sets the mode for knowing the nature of the artist, and how the narrator and characters of the fictional world of Mörike's novel operate according to Lavaterian procedures when making assumptions about human nature. But since *Maler Nolten* is primarily concerned with the discovery and development of an artist, whenever the text turns to regard and reflect upon faces, it does so for reasons more consequential than those of idle curiosity or innocent fun. Mörike's text realizes in the practice of physiognomy a technological system predesigned to assist and regulate the determination of the artist. In the following pages I will indicate how the observations made about or by the characters consciously evoke a system that is most particular as to the form taken by the genial figure, as to the kind of man who is cut out to be an artist or intellectual. I will argue that the physiognomical strategies comprising *Maler Nolten* cohere to some of the fundamental discoveries of cultural critics such as George L. Mosse, Diana Fuss, Michel Foucault, and Eve Kosovsky Sedgwick. Mörike's depiction of a fictional world of artists and aesthetes shows how influential people use the preconceived and popularly disseminated notions of certain appearances to judge the compatibility of an individual with their role or place in society. This regulatory, yet everyday, behavior influences the organization of society in the novel, benefitting those who look the part, and excluding those who do not. Candidates for social circles of fine art are particularly affected since they are necessarily measured against an ideal of the manly genius. Taking my cues initially from the work of Mosse, but also from the unique critical perspectives of Fuss, Foucault, and Sedgwick, I intend to show how commentators in Mörike's fiction operate according to criteria that have been specifically designed in the interests of a select group of men. Indeed, the physiognomical gaze is governed by the assumption that men who label themselves artists or intellectuals, and who are manly and handsome, are indeed perceived by like men to be artists or intellectuals, that the women who rally to support and praise the men without controlling them are taken to be beautiful, and that, conversely, there are counterimages of 'fishy' men and 'dark' women who fall short of the ideal physical requirements, but whose deviant appearances are required by the ideal for its own validation and consolidation of power.

In his work *The Image of Man. The Creation of Modern Masculinity*, George L. Mosse traces the emergence of the normative ideal of the modern masculine stereotype in the latter half of the eighteenth century and its impact on Western cultures in the following two hundred years. He cites and connects the diverse work of several prominent cultural figures including Winckelmann, Lavater, Goethe, Friedrich Schiller, Wilhelm von Humboldt, J. F. C. Guts Muth, Friedrich Ludwig Jahn, Friedrich Ehrenberg, among others. Motivated by the Enlightenment belief in the individual's ability to cultivate or better 'himself,' these historians, theologians, scientists, educators, and artists constituted an intellectual network that assembled a body of knowledge that projected and governed notions of the aesthetically and socially most desirable appearance and behavior of men. The image of man they created took as its principal standard Winckelmann's imaginative descriptions of copies or remnants of ancient Greek sculptures. Winckelmann considered these replicas and relics exemplary of human form since he believed they embodied a balance of athletic strength and emotional self-restraint. His most treasured sculpturesque subjects were more often than not smooth-skinned young men, or ephebic creatures, pubescent boys on the threshold of manhood (cf. MacLeod, "The 'Third Sex'" 199-201; Kevin Parker, esp. 539-41; see also Baeumer; Derks; Richter). Key to this image is its encapsulation of what-is-about-to-come and therefore the notion of *Bildung* ("formation"), since the developing body and intellect of the youth is eventually succeeded by the mature male in the natural evolution from boyhood to adulthood. Mosse contends Winckelmann's aesthetic assumptions were enveloped by the phenomenon of *Bildung* as its aim became the very compliance with an ideal of masculinity (8). The ideal image modeled on the representations of the young athletes and mythological heroes of antiquity studied by Winckelmann became the standard of manly beauty that, in turn, provided the terms or outward signs by which one was to know the inner virtues of purity, honesty, and self-restraint that comprised human moral greatness (23, 25, 79). It is not insignificant that Winckelmann mentions only two professional groups among the Greeks: athletes, and the artists, writers, and philosophers who studied them or who also took part in their competitions (Mosse 32; Namowicz 71) – the second group being hardly removed from Winckelmann's own profession of art historian and critic. This suggests a close affinity or exclusive symmetry between the two groups that infers as comparably masculine and compatible the physical prowess of one and the erudition of the other. The idea was to educate the self or build one's character in order to become a *respectable citizen* by exercising the mind and body; that a sound mind produces a sound body, and a healthy body leads to a healthy mind (36). Mosse remarks, for instance, that Goethe discovered in Winckelmann's homoaffective cultural critique "confirmation of his ideal of the autonomous human being who must educate himself through art to a greater humanity" (36).[38] In fact, those cultural producers and commentators engaged in the ongoing construction of the male aesthetic ideal at the same time insisted on the manliness of *Bildung* and genius. Thus, the 'real man,' that masculine male type most defined by his athletic proportions, physical competence, and show of strength and vitality, came to signify moral well-being, mental vigor, and, so, worth.

---

[38] On this point Mosse refers to Namowicz who states that "Winckelmann's achievement was to be understood as 'preparation,' as a first step in the great work of education [Bildung]" (118, my trans.). Goethe's own words best indicate the simple conviction with which he considered Winckelmann the epitome of the autonomous individual and the equation of man: "When ... one finds in particularly gifted people this joint need zealously to look also in the exterior world for the corresponding counterpart to everything that nature has instilled in them and thereby to raise the inner completely to the whole and the certain, one can be sure that also such a most pleasant existence for the world and posterity will develop. Our Winckelmann was of this kind. Nature had instilled in him that which makes and adorns a man. However, he spent his entire life searching for that which he considered appropriate, excellent, and worthy in humanity as well as in art devoted especially to humanity" (my trans.); "Findet sich ... in besonders begabten Menschen jenes gemeinsame Bedürfnis, eifrig, zu allem was die Natur in sie gelegt hat, auch in der äußeren Welt die antwortenden Gegenbilder zu suchen und dadurch das Innere völlig zum Ganzen und Gewissen zu steigern, so kann man versichert sein, daß auch so ein für Welt und Nachwelt höchst erfreuliches Dasein sich ausbilden werde. Unser Winckelmann war von dieser Art. In ihn hatte die Natur gelegt, was den Mann macht und ziert. Dagegen verwendete er sein ganzes Leben ein ihm Gemäßes, Treffliches und Würdiges im Menschen und in der Kunst, die sich vorzüglich mit dem Menschen beschäftigt, aufzusuchen" ("Winckelmann" 415-16). Also, for the interrelation of the will to knowledge and the sensory objectification of the sculpturesque body in Goethe, see Derwin who analyzes the attainment of *Bildung* – and, I would add, manhood – by the attention and reflection given to the *female* beloved's body in the fifth poem of Goethe's "Römische Elegien" ("Roman Elegies," begun in 1788), his rite of poetic passage (esp. 252-57). The modern gender switch of the object of artistic contemplation is an example of a different kind of transformation of Winckelmann's conception of the processes of Greek art occurring by the end of the 1700s from those Namowicz has in mind (69).

Considering the emphasis on the male form in Winckelmann's work, it is important to note that the art critic's original and groundbreaking accounting for the exceptional quality of classical artworks is only in part the culmination of self-study, that is, of his extensive background reading in the geography, philosophy, and literature of ancient Greece (E. M. Butler). It is also a testimony to the author's homoerotic fantasy. Winckelmann's love of young men, and his discovery of the affirmation of this love in the sodomitical cultural structures reported in several Greek texts, comprise the motivation for his sustained interest in Greek works in the first place (see Sweet; cf. Parker 536). The sculptures of predominantly young men that Winckelmann lauded, and which formed the basis of Western art ideals and helped to set in place normative masculine forms for the next two hundred years or more, initially took their esteemed place in cultural and social history as a direct result of Winckelmann's same-sex desire (Mosse 32). Indeed, the gaze that underpins the modern art world and has authorized ideal masculinity, but that also informs a physiognomical discourse that sequesters the masculine ideal in order visually to represent genius and *Bildung*, is, in essence, "homospectatorial." This is the term contemporary feminist critic Diana Fuss conceives in order to describe the consuming gaze of women's fashion photography that is sustained by an implicit female homosexual economy of desire. Similarly, the eighteenth-century art authority Winckelmann offers an erotic exegesis of images of the male body as ideal form for the perusal and consumption by an audience of particularly male intellectuals.[39] These male viewers concur Winckelmann's claims (and authority) because they recognize in those examples at least a part of the image of themselves. That is, they begin to self-identify with and so wish to confirm the plastic ideal presented before them. But having discovered a part of themselves in the ideal, these art acolytes and intellectuals must in turn desire to be desired in the same way by their fellow men so that they too can be recognized as exemplary men or respected as highly cultured citizens. Men thus imitate the art they most esteem. This circulation of same-sex male desire reoccurs among the portrayal and description of intellectuals with Winckelmann's aesthetic bedfellow in physiognomics.

---

[39] For the extent and dynamics of the male audience of Winckelmann's correspondence, see Richter, "Winckelmann's Progeny."

In its theorization of the eminent figure of the genial artist, Lavater's work essentially imitates Winckelmann's reflections on the imitation of Greek works. The affect of Winckelmann on Lavater's reinvention of physiognomy in the 1780s was so immediate because of the physiognomist's overwhelming reliance on artistic renditions of faces for his analyses, rather than direct empirical observations of clinical subjects – a criticism levied against Lavater by medical professor Karl Heinrich Baumgärtner in his *Krankenphysiognomik* (1842) (Stafford 102). The respective subject-matter both of art and of physiognomical discourse, that is, the ideal body and the nature of outward appearances, converge in the artistically informed physiognomizing customs of the art community featured in Mörike's *Maler Nolten*. Fascinatingly, here, artistic promise is typically equated with the desirable form of a young man, and cultural ambition with the desire in the male subject to be desirable to male figures of authority.

Just as Lavater's physiognomies of artists such as Raphael and poets such as Goethe are indicative of their time in that they rely on a sublime – and sublimating – male aesthetic ideal after Winckelmann, so it is typical that the protagonist and novice artist of Mörike's *Maler Nolten* is seen by those around him to resemble the model of the apostolic, ephebic, and at once attractive manly face and appearance of the artist-intellectual advanced by Lavater. At any rate, Mörike's text evokes the whole tradition of *Bildung* and the desirable male youth from Winckelmann through Lavater and Goethe to Jahn. The brief elaboration of the well-dressed and good-looking (20) Theobald Nolten – still in his early twenties – as being "gesund und frisch genug" (30) is suggestive of the motto *frisch, fromm, fröhlich, frei* ("cheerful, devout, merry, and free") used to promote the nineteenth-century German gymnastics movement associated particularly with Jahn. This positing of Nolten as appealing, pure, and healthy is intensified by the narrator who refers to him as "the unspoilt youth,"[40] thus signaling that the young man is ready to be groomed for his future career. The boyish aspect of Nolten's young manhood is preserved somewhat artificially both by Larkens and by Nolten himself. Larkens reports to Leopold that two days before the New Year he had found a Gypsy woman – presumably Elisabeth – in the entrance-hall to his house who had wanted to see "'the "pretty and lovely boy"'"; in a letter addressed to his friend, Larkens calls Nolten "exquisite boy"; and as coauthors of the insert "Ein Tag aus Noltens Jugendleben" ("A Day in the Life of the Youth Nolten") Larkens and Nolten use the similar expression "the 'pretty and good boy'" to refer to the protagonist at the age of sixteen.[41]

---

[40] "der unverdorbene Jüngling" (26).

But Nolten is not the only manifestation of the intellectually esteemed, aesthetically pleasing boyish type or ephebus to be found in the novel. In particular Christoph, whom Larkens has arranged to sing and tell fairy tales and stories on the Albani[42] tower, is described as "a young and pretty lad."[43] On an impulsive visit to the old Privy Councillor, Theobald comes across "an unprepossessingly clothed lad" who has "an unbelievably pleasant physiognomy [and] the brightest eyes that very mischievously laugh back at the artist [who was also] struck particularly by the [boy's] delicate curls."[44] The gardener's blind son and talented organist Henni (Heinrich) is also said to have a "tender form"[45] to his face. However, more stereotypically masculine poses are found in the brief descriptions of the characters of Marwin, Raymund, and the Colonel ("Obrist"). Marwin, the son of the Gypsy chieftain, is described in the painter Friedrich Nolten's diary as "a clever chap who is attractive in a manly way."[46] The sculptor Raymund is "a slim man with a black beard" and

---

[41] "'den "schönen herrlichen Jungen"'" (194); "herrlicher Junge!" (253); "de[r] 'hübsche[] gute[] Junge[]'" (205).

[42] The name of this tower in Mörike's novel may well be insignificant, but it might possibly be an allusion to Winckelmann's Roman employer and patron Cardinal Albani.

[43] "ein[] junge[r] hübsche[r] Bursche[]" (37).

[44] "einen unscheinbar gekleideten Knaben" (264); "Eine unglaublich angenehme Gesichtsbildung, die hellsten Augen, sehr mutwillig, lachen dem Maler entgegen, dem besonders die zierlich gelockten Haare auffallen" (265). Both the boy and the female model present here appear to correspond both with Winckelmann's and with Lavater's standards of human form: Theobald remarks to himself about the woman, "But what a magnificent head! ... the Roman fortitude in the flourish of the back of the head from the strong nape of the neck on contrasted so touchingly with the child-like qualities of the countenance." "Aber welch ein herrlicher Kopf! ... die römische Kraft im Schwunge des Hinterhaupts vom starken Nacken an kontrastierte so rührend gegen das Kindliche des Angesichts" (265).

[45] "zarte Bildung" (381).

[46] "ein gescheiter männlich schöner Kerl (219).

"a wild boar."[47] The Colonel, Adelheid's husband and Theobald Nolten's brother-in-law, is "a tall and handsome man" and has "such a secretive face."[48] He tells the story of the death of a stag – a long-established literary code for the beloved in an affectionate male-male relationship (see Roth) – and the robber Marmetin, or Jung Volker, an unrivaled and talented violinist and a lifelong stranger to the desire for women (319). The fact that each and every one of these fleeting, yet on the whole positive examples of male appearance is linked either to artistic promise, to an artist's observations, to the performance of narrative, poetry, or music, or to the very production of art seems only to underscore an apparently inherent (yet clearly fabricated) relation of sameness between the world of artists and the ideal of the masculine form. Baron von Neuburg even subscribes to the physiognomical belief "'that people of [a] pleasantly fantastic complexion ... are born to be poets and artists.'"[49] Yet, clearly those whose exterior impressions embody the ephebic and masculine stereotype are selected to play an active part in the field of cultural production.

In light of the discursive connection between popular conceptions of youthful masculinity and artist-figures, it should not strike the modern reader as particularly unusual when Lavater remarks that portrait painting is "The most ... manly ... of arts" (*Essays* 170). Indeed, throughout the time of the German *Kunstperiode*, 'nature,' 'usefulness,' 'nobility,' and 'the ability to make something difficult appear easy' – or restraint – that is, the other qualities Lavater apportions to portrait painting (*Essays* 170), were wholly synonymous with the composite ideal of manly beauty appropriated by artists and intellectuals to demonstrate the virtuous soul. That male aesthetic ideal then – with physiognomy as just one of the nodes within its discursive network of intellectual bodies, and which the cultural producer also comes to epitomize through the fitness of his mind or the manliness of his *Bildung* – is generated by cultural producers as part of the concerted and collective performance of their own ordination as legitimate authorities of the design of all humanity. In his work *Discipline*

---

[47] "ein schlanker, schwarzbärtiger Mann," "ein wilder Eber" (266).

[48] "ein hoher schöner Mann" (313); "so ein visage de contrebande" (312).

[49] "'daß Subjekte von dieser angenehm phantastischen Komplexion ... zu Dichtern und Künstlern geboren sind'" (302).

and Punish. The Birth of the Prison, Michel Foucault suggests that the social institutions created in the Enlightenment and nineteenth century do not represent the very foundations of a free society of individuals, but rather are a part of a "micro-physics of power," a means of exercising social control. In the spirit of a Foucauldian analysis, I regard the "body politic" of physiognomy "as a set of material elements and techniques that serve as ... supports for the power and knowledge relations that invest human bodies and subjugate them by turning them into objects of knowledge" (28). Indeed, physiognomy must be analyzed as an assertive narrative tactic for expressing power. The positive and self-aggrandizing descriptions of artists and intellectuals, largely based on the trope of virtuous and desirable manliness, enables these very same cultural producers to establish a superior position within the pseudoscientific system of physiognomy and, thus, to maintain a position of symbolic privilege in society as the cultural elite. They use such representational prerequisites to regulate, that is either to approve or to deny access to, those particular individuals wishing to join their ranks. The skilled physiognomical practitioner – always a man of letters, a scholar, artist, or poet – mobilizes social opinion in favor of the privileged position of a certain hegemony – namely, men of letters – while frustrating the social destiny of members of other groups in society. Consequently, the discourse that formulates the ideal composition of an artist or intellectual's face in order to supervise, in a relatively efficient way, the right of entry of those in the population with aspirations of becoming acknowledged cultural producers, does so by depending on criteria that need never refer to the quality or quantity of an individual's actual cultural production. *All one needs is the right face*. And that face, while supposedly conveying a certain social function of cultural producers – of faithfully disseminating the truth – must be in keeping with the male aesthetic ideal and so inevitably adheres to unconditional notions of the male gender.

IV.

Negotiated as it is by a physiognomical system informed by a male aesthetic ideal, the masculinist realm of cultural producers and artistic authority most immediately excludes the gender category of women from its higher ranks. As mentioned above, Lavater admits to not knowing many women. However, this does not prevent him from forming opinions on the respective merits or liabilities of certain female faces. In Lavater's scheme, the extent to which a female subject is thought to possess the most womanly of natures – to be an ideal woman – is directly proportionate to the extent to which the dimensions of her facial features differ from those common among men (cf. *Fragmente* 263-69). Likewise, her ideal nature must be diametrically opposed to that of a man: ideally, women are supportive of men's actions. Lavater remarks that from their faces it is known that women "are the resonance of man ... taken from man to be subservient to man, to comfort him with the consolation of an angel, to lighten his cares."[50]

In *Maler Nolten* the positive references to Constanze's angelic, fair, and carefree outward appearance (33, 85, 104) reflect most succinctly the typical terms of the ideal woman as promulgated by physiognomical reading.[51] The knowledge of her female beauty certifies her role as facilitator of and supportive subordinate to men's intellectuality. Indeed, when Constanze draws "the silhouette of the head of a delightful boy that looks upward at something pleading with urgent glances," her efforts are immediately modified by the painter Tillsen who adds, "opposite the little face imploring sympathy, the powerful torso of a man in a threatening attitude."[52] The result is reminiscent of the famous silhouette of Goethe giving a lesson to Fritz von Stein (see Kroeber 57, plate 21; Hickman 38). At the same time, it is a travesty of the ancient Greek statue of Laocoön that depicts a father's valiant attempt to save his sons from a serpent – that statue so revered by Winckelmann. Either way, it is a clear indication of the strict and strictly male discourses informing art ideals. Constanze's participation in art is seized upon, corrected, and enhanced by Tillsen. A woman's dabbling furnishes an opportunity for a man to assert, both figuratively and literally, an overbearing male intellectuality. A short while later, and using the term "Geschlecht" – the German word for both "gender" and "species" – Constanze remarks to a reflective Nolten that it is for their own intellectual good that women do not participate in any learned debate on art, but rather support men who are artists: "'The sublime whims of this species of artists are difficult to apprehend, and we shrewd women take great pains every time so as not to betray our nonsense, our simple-mindedness during such subtle discussions where we can only listen in, only fumble and half reply ... and so we [women] can in the end do nothing better than keep silent with significance and direct the gentlemen to their genius.'"[53] The opposition between the "whim" of male artists and the "significance" of "shrewd women" underscores the irony of these otherwise self-effacing comments. Constanze's words must be read less as a confession of the limited intellectual capacities of women and more as a subtle criticism of the limits imposed on the practical and technical wherewithal of women in regard to art matters as a direct consequence of their exclusion from art discourse by men.[54] However, although her *words* strike a dissonant chord, it must be remembered that Constanze's *face* is known in the terms of an angel, and it is this fact that initially corroborates a certain subservient role as a woman upon her. Indeed, the concrete limitations that exclude women from any authoritative position in the art community are primarily sanctioned by a physiognomical knowledge that promotes the exclusive ideal of women who may well support, but who themselves never engender artistic expression. Mörike's novel thus reflects – and perhaps questions – the restrictive physiognomical perception of women of his time that obliges them to adopt the position of companion, consoler, and servant. Women are to engage themselves in encouraging the authority of the male artistic genius by acting as artists' models, as in the case with the sculptor Raymund's wife Henriette (265) and the painter Friedrich Nolten's wife Loskine (228). In the case of young Theobald Nolten, this role is enacted by Elisabeth (193, 395) and is envisioned for Agnes (cf. 11-12, 14, and 439).

---

[50] "Sie sind Nachlaut der Mannheit ... vom Manne genommen, dem Mann unterthan zu seyn, zu trösten ihn mit Engelstrost, zu leichtern seine Sorgen" (264).

[51] For a possible biographical prototype of Constanze, see Immerwahr ("Loves" 77-78).

[52] "die Umrisse eines lieblichen Knabenkopfs, welcher mit dringenden Blicken bittend an etwas hinaufsieht"; "den oberen kraftvollen Körper eines Mannes in drohender Gebärde dem Mitleid fordernden Gesichtchen gegenüber" (80).

---

[53] "'Die erhabenen Grillen dieses Geschlechts von Künstlern sind schwer zu fassen, und wir scharfsinnigen Frauen haben jedesmal Mühe, um bei dergleichen subtilen Erörterungen, wo wir nur lauschen, nur tasten und halb erwidern können, nicht unsern Blödsinn, unsre Einfalt zu verraten ... und so können wir [Frauen] zuletzt nichts Besseres tun, als – mit Bedeutung schweigen und die Herren an ihren Genius verweisen'" (88).

[54] Indeed, the intellectual world is set aside by men for men. At times, women are ushered off the scene before the men get down to talking business (9, 21) or, as is the case at President von K.'s house, they are separated from the men altogether (378). Bohnengel points out that *Geschichte* (story/history) and the past are portrayed, recalled, and handed down in *Maler Nolten* entirely from the perspective of male characters (48).

Conscious of a physiognomical discourse on the variety of natures comprising humanity, Mörike's novel about the development of an artist sorts its characters by allocating the culturally most coveted positions to those whose appearances complement a particular ideal. It thus presents its rising young artistic hero as a man who ranks as central and typical among a cadre of male cultural producers whose respective ephebic and manly physiognomies verify, by pertaining to an aesthetic ideal of youthful manliness, their rightful status as artists and intellectuals. Likewise, Mörike's text demonstrates the operation of an ideal female beauty that – regulated in relation to and in the service of the cultural ambitions of men – supposedly typifies the auxiliary nature of women. Received physiognomical knowledge is evoked to indicate the suitability of any given individual with a particular role in society; that is, to judge who – or specifically which men – may take on the part of artists, and who – or specifically which women – may best serve the symbolically privileged position of those artists. Yet, while focusing on Nolten's rise and the respective precedent and nurturing roles played by his community of fellow artists, patrons, and admirers, Mörike's text is also concerned with summoning, but then limiting, the appearance and interference of those whose natures or identities do not exactly coincide with the ideals concomitant with aesthetic circles. Just as there are people whose physical and facial types are selected to represent human traits considered desirable for and indicative of the esteemed profession of artists, there is also – both in physiognomical discourse and in Mörike's novel – a series of other people who are restrained by physiognomical terms and conditions from taking part either as conveners or as active members of the privileged class of art and cultural producers. The ideal male artist and female adjunct, abetted by the specter of the face, are accompanied by correlating physiognomical countertypes. This is strikingly, but succinctly evident in the already qualified category of women. Just as Constanze is the embodiment of the beautiful and subordinate ideal female, figures such as Elisabeth, Agnes, and Margot are portrayed as in some way inappropriately, inaccurately, or insufficiently representing that ideal. Their respective deviance relegates each in turn from fulfilling an entirely positive, permanent, and widely acknowledged position in relation to the male world of art.

At first glance, Elisabeth, Agnes, and Margot may be considered beauties in their own right. The reader's attention is drawn to Elisabeth's "beauty" (194, 204), Agnes's "charms" (288), and the fact that Margot is "extraordinarily beautiful" (380). Such epithets would appear to signal concomitant ideal natures. Yet in each case, the narrative instance of the description of their beauty is framed, qualified, and controlled by a series of brief remarks made, more often than not, by the (male) narrator or male characters and that amounts to nothing short of debilitating diagnoses. Both Elisabeth and Agnes are assigned pathological conditions as a result of the impression of observing their outward appearances. Margot, on the other hand, is the object of admiration, but also scorn and pity.

The enigmatic influence of the dark-eyed and brown-skinned Gypsy Elisabeth, the catalyst for Nolten's juvenile sensual and poetic awakening (if we are to believe Larkens's hype), is modified during the course of the novel by a series of persistent cautions that draw attention to her foreignness (204, 206, 450) and mark her physical appearance as mad (102, 204, 209, 274, 411, 450, 454) and uncanny (193, 450). As a free-roaming and homeless Gypsy, Elisabeth's identity does not pertain to the traditional ideal of the stable and devoted female. On the contrary, Nolten's Father is not short of derogatory names by which to call her: "A fortune-teller ... a vagrant ... a witch ... a heathen."[55] As her resemblance to the portrait of her mother indicates, Elisabeth's outward appearance represents an unknown quantity, a sexual force unto herself (cf. 219 and 228). Graeme Tytler remarks that the wildness of Gypsies has the aesthetic value of "criticism of an overcivilized society" (178; cf. Bohnengel 64-65). Sabrina Hausdörfer points out how Nolten's physiognomy approaches that of Elisabeth whom he blames for his decline (244). Once having exercised a strange influence over Nolten, Elisabeth's beauty is lent a fatalistic and unrestrained nature via the prejudices associated with her race and, so, cannot serve the young man in his quest for attaining the heights of a *noble* artist. Her beauty is thus entirely inappropriate to the polite ambitions of a young artist.

Long before she makes a physical appearance, Agnes is the subject of much discussion – especially in regard to her romantic inclination for another man called Otto –

---

[55] "eine Kartenschlägerin ... eine Landfährerin ... eine Hexe ... eine Heidin" (211).

that always refers to a possible nervous or mental illness, perhaps, even, paranoia (53, 58, 62, 64, 71-72, 100-02).[56] Once informed of Agnes's troubles, Theobald Nolten reflects on his fiancee's "initial, so utterly pure nature" and the fact that he is now forever bereft of "the first sacred notion of purity, humility, [and] natural [literally: 'uncolored'] tendency."[57] Later, when Nolten is reunited with Agnes in the second part of the novel and she can be observed in the flesh for the first time, he notices that his fiancee's appearance has changed since he last saw her, that it differs from the image he remembers. Her dark blue eyes, the peculiar shape of her eyebrows, and her perfect teeth still indicate "something enchanting" and "a great deal of robust comeliness," but her once almost blond hair is now chestnut brown and she has developed into the fullness of a grown woman: "Her entire figure had really become more resolute, much stronger, indeed, as Theobald believed, even bigger."[58] Face to face with his matrimonial prospects, Nolten realizes that the angelic paragon of pastoral beauty, which he (and Larkens) once imagined as facilitator of his romantic and artistic impulses – twice Agnes is alluded to as Nolten's ideal (51, 188) – is quite different from the reality of Agnes he now encounters. Her former blondness might well have been the cosmetic creation of Nolten and Larkens's combined imaginations. (Or she might even have been a 'bottle-blonde'!) Her reconfiguration necessarily concedes new meaning. Nolten is convinced that "this lovely miracle" is marked by "illness and dark distress."[59] In short, the changes observed by Nolten expose the self-deception of his earlier notions of Agnes: when he realizes she does not match up to his fantasy (since she has undergone natural, physical changes beyond any man's control), he takes possession of her again by reclassifying her as mentally unbalanced and by transforming himself into her "guardian angel."[60] The psychopathological levy upon Agnes continues in the text, reducing her to the aggregate of romantic speculation between Nolten, Larkens, Elisabeth, and Margot, until her death (288, 291-92, 416-25, 436).

---

[56] Agnes is based on the real-life figures of Luise Rau and Klärchen Neuffer (Immerwahr, "Loves" 75-76; Maync 113).

[57] "ursprüngliche, so äußerst reine Natur," "den ersten heiligen Begriff von Reinheit, Demut, ungefärbter Neigung"(72).

[58] "etwas Bezauberndes," "viel kräftige Anmut" (288); "Wirklich war ihre ganze Figur entschiedener, mächtiger, ja wie Theobald meinte, selbst größer geworden" (287).

[59] "diese[r] schöne[] Wunder," "Krankheit und dunkler Kummer" (288).

The most categorical, physiognomically ascertained countertype to the image of the ideal subordinate female is found in the figure of President von K.'s daughter Margot (see also Horstmann 146-53; Tscherpel 39). As a woman savant, she is the only female character in Mörike's novel, other than Constanze, who endeavors to contribute to the realm of art and scholarly learning. Yet since she represents such an intellectual force, she is caught in a paralyzing double-bind set in place by the operations of physiognomy: her form paradoxically bears both feminine and masculine characteristics. According to the pseudoscience of the face, to be considered highly intellectual, one must necessarily demonstrate traits in keeping with an aesthetic ideal that is specifically male. But for a woman to appear intellectual, and, therefore, masculine, would mean, of course, that she is no longer the very exemplification of ideal womanhood. Popular discursive standards do not permit a woman to be viewed as an educated authority and at the same time remain entirely, purely, a woman. Margot is described in terms whose generally positive nature, that is, "most sociable and unceremonious being,"[61] is made peculiar by immediate qualification. The narrator makes a point of taking the time for a physiognomical commentary of Margot's appearance:

> The most lively heart combined with a keen mind – which, under the father's direct influence, had apprehended the various fields of knowledge otherwise deemed suitable only for the male gender (allow me to speak boldly) with an inborn passion and without the slightest trace of learned coquettishness – seemed [like] adequate qualities to reconcile with an exterior that, at least for a common eye, had little that

---

[60] "schützenden Engel" (331). Even Constanze is eventually inconsistent in her role and position as art-lover (see Schüpfer). Governess Frau von Niethelm's doubts remarked to Nolten that "a strange grief" ("ein seltsamer Gram" 273) that has overcome Constanze is the result particularly of a physical illness shifts also Constanze into a psychopathological discourse.

[61] "Margots höchst umgängliches und ungeniertes Wesen" (379).

> was charming, or, to put it correctly, among many charming points, had much that was remarkable in an unpleasant way. Her figure was extraordinarily beautiful, although *only moderately tall*. Her head in and of itself [was] of the noblest outline, and the oval face, without *the swollen mouth and the snub nose*, could not have been formed more delicately. Also, she had a *brown*, yet very healthy skin, and a pair of *large dark* eyes. (My emphasis.)[62]

The so-called "unpleasant" details traced by the narrator concerning Margot's height, lips, nose, and, perhaps, also skin and eyes qualify the basic assertion of her 'exceptional beauty.' The result is the transparent physiognomical evidence of the contradiction of an intellectual soul in a (black) woman. Margot is beautiful in spite of herself, and far from ideal. But this contradiction apparently predicates (and again qualifies) the interest of certain local educated young men. They find in her exoticism, in her "so peculiar composition," the confirmation of the kind of dialectic equation evocative of the philosophies of Johann Gottlieb Fichte or Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling, since they maintain that "the contradictory parts of this face are fused in the most charming way into an inseparable whole by the complete expression of the soul."[63] Indeed, Margot's appearance can only be understood as an explanation of her existence as it relates to the intellectual and romantic interests of men, or rather as it relates to women who have been co-opted to serve the interests of men. "The African woman" is a pleasant curiosity for educated men who admire her, much to the chagrin of the less edified local beauties, and thus earn "the derisory name of the connoisseurs of fine and exotic African wares."[64] Meanwhile, for dandies, she is nothing but an object of fun and the unnatural product of learning. A particular lieutenant is said to have once remarked that "on closer inspection one notices on the President's daughter a fine little beard about the lips that probably derives from the fact that as a child she let herself be kissed by the old grumble-beards such as the Ciceros and Xenophons and forgot to wash her mouth clean [afterward]."[65] The combination of masculine with feminine physical conventions is remarkable enough to prohibit the learned woman Margot from occupying a *normal* position in social, gender, and sexual matters. Like Elisabeth and Agnes before her, her oppression and disaffection for the normative ideal of woman is sexualized. Mocked for appearing not to have washed away the remnants of the attentions of old learned men, she is read by at least one passing character as unclean or perverse. Such negative implications mean that Margot is rather an object of pity than one of fascination. The narrator informs the reader that from childhood on Margot has dissociated herself from any heartfelt sentiment, that she had never known friendship, in fact, was never even aware of this deficiency in her, until she met Agnes (391-92). It might even be possible to make the case that Margot is lesbian. The change that overcomes her after meeting Agnes is explained "since she saw in Agnes perhaps the first female creature whom she was able to love for the heart's sake, and by whom she wanted to be loved in return."[66] Certainly, Margot's "so peculiar composition" signifies she is an exceptional, perhaps impure woman. In her instance the knowledge of the face is mobilized as a transparent proof of the unusual, unnatural, and unpleasant phenomenon of learned women. Physiognomical technology thus reserves final judgment on Margot in that she is representative neither of the 'real woman' nor of the 'true intellectual.'

---

[62] "Das munterste Herz, verbunden mit einem scharfen Verstande, der unter dem unmittelbaren Einflusse des Vaters, verschiedene, sonst nur dem männlichen Geschlecht zukommende Fächer der Wissenschaft, man darf kecklich sagen, mit angeborener Leidenschaft und ohne den geringsten Zug von gelehrter Koketterie ergriffen hatte, schienen hinreichende Eigenschaften, um mit einem Äußern zu versöhnen, das wenigstens für ein gewöhnliches Auge nicht viel Einnehmendes, oder um es recht zu sagen, bei viel Einnehmendem, manches unangenehm Auffallende hatte. Die Figur war außerordentlich schön, obgleich nur mäßig hoch, der Kopf an sich von dem edelsten Umriß, und das ovale Gesicht hätte, ohne den aufgequollenen Mund und die Stumpfnase, nicht zärter geformt sein können; dazu kam eine braune, wenngleich sehr frische Haut, und ein Paar große dunkle Augen" (379-80).

[63] "so eigene Zusammensetzung"; "es werden die widersprechenden Teile dieses Gesichts durch den vollen Ausdruck von Seele in ein unzertrennliches Ganzes auf die reizendste Art verschmolzen" (380).

By positing the fair and aristocratic Constanze against the dark, mad, and excessive Gypsy Elisabeth, the darkening, ill, and insufficient country girl Agnes, and the dark, sad, and both excessive and insufficient 'African' Margot, Mörike's novel is not blindly drawing on the Lavaterian conviction of the representative truth of physiognomy. Nor does it deny the power and popularity of physiognomy as a means of making assumptions about the nature of people as far as certain ideal conceptions are concerned. Rather, as the depictions of the four abovementioned women show, *Maler Nolten* indicates that the attempts to locate, attain, and maintain the dimensions of the ideal notion of woman both allows and requires some occasional adaptation and necessary tailoring to the physiognomizing male artist's needs (see also Bohnengel esp. 64-65; Hausdörfer 242-44, 246-47; Schüpfer 43, 46, 49, 51, 103-04, 121-24). The text appropriates a system of ingrained popular wisdom that oversees the judgment of faces in order to exclude those women who are unable or unwilling to put aside their own desires to contribute 'as an ideal' to the preservation of male intellectual entitlement. The very process that conceives an ideal equally dispenses a terminology that casts doubt on others' mental disposition, sexual libido, or the degree to which they may feel human emotion. Whether these women are insane, oversexed, melancholy, or not, such labels are readily applied and given damning evidence by a momentary and authoritative appraisal of certain aspects and features of the face. Those women whose identities somehow fall short or overstep the chosen parameters of the ideal subservient nature of woman are still further oppressed, victimized, and deterred from having their influence felt, since their deviance – far from undermining the exclusion of women or genuinely threatening the exclusive right of men to be artists or intellectuals – is maintained physiognomically as if to legitimize the superiority of the ideal.

---

[64] "diese Afrikanerin"; "den Spottnamen der afrikanischen Fremd- und Feinschmecker" (380).

[65] "man bemerke an des Präsidenten Tochter, bei genauerer Betrachtung, ein feines Bärtchen um die Lippen, welches wohl daher komme, daß sie als Kind sich schon von den alten Knasterbärten, den Ciceros und Xenophons habe küssen lassen, und vergessen, sich den Mund rein zu wischen" (380).

[66] "da sie in Agnesen vielleicht die erste weibliche Kreatur erblickte, welche sie von Grund des Herzens lieben konnte und von der sie wiedergeliebt zu werden wünschte" (392).

Whereas the examples provided by the various physiognomies and natures of certain female characters in *Maler Nolten* show quite succinctly and distinctly the damaging effects of trying to organize intellectual society in relation to the interests of men in general (Margot is the only one of the four women to live beyond the final words of the novel), the circumstances between men, that is, the nature of the interpersonal relations between men and how this relates to the interests of men in the realm of art and culture, is far more intricate, yet by no means any less oppressive for a certain number and type of men. Once again, careful attention to physiognomy – this time in regard to men's faces – shows how the pseudoscience is taken up by the social world of the novel to organize its artistically and intellectually determined men in a continuous line of individuals whose features, in ever varying degrees, do or do not match up with the ideal requirements of the artist-figure. The physiognomical arrangement of men demonstrates which kind of man is acceptable and which kind is not. I have already shown that the Nolten-type, the handsome, youthful, and athletic lad, represents the desired aesthetic form of the artist-figure. But this core group of promising young artist-types is countered by a series of men whose appearances clash with the ideal. It is now time to discover who and what is not so desirable.

V.

Mosse claims that the ideal of masculine beauty and moral worth was even supported by a negative stereotype of men, the opposite of the positive stereotype in body and soul (6, 45). He identifies these "countertypes" or outsiders in the figures of Gypsies, vagrants, Jews, habitual criminals, the insane, 'sexual deviants,' and effeminate men (57, 66, 83; see also Gilman, *Rasse* 7; Hergemöller 24ff, 39ff). Likewise, where the ideal representation of the artist or intellectual in the decades around 1800 is concerned, those who do not cut a manly physiognomy are disadvantaged and obstructed from gaining access to the exclusive world of men of letters since their facial features are viewed (by this 'inner party' of intellectuals) as indicative of bearing the marks of one or several of a series of negative qualities not compatible with the character of an artist. The selection of these negative elements was primarily based on their deviation from the late-eighteenth-century aesthetic consideration of 'nature' that had initially sustained the composite ideals both of manhood and of art, and that "was opposed to deformity, to any departure from the norm, [and] to affectation" (Honour 105). As the figures of Lörmer, Larkens, and Wispel in Mörike's novel attest, the material or descriptive elements of negative stereotyping indeed include disfigurement, disease, or mental illness, deviance from the norm or antisociality, and excess or artificiality, as well as strangeness or foreignness, a lack of productivity, and a criminal predisposition. Consequently, by the standards set by men of letters, any one of these three *Others* can only be considered counterfeit or impossible in regard both to artistic or intellectual genius as well as to the cultural economy. None of them has quite the right face and each in turn is prevented from being officially recognized as an artist-figure.

The narrative tactics of the power-knowledge relations of physiognomy operate to varying degrees depending on the nature of the object to be excluded, that is, on the other's social relation to the physiognomizing hegemony of the cultural establishment. For instance, the dilemma of class difference is a relatively simple hurdle to impose and thereby overcome. As a gunsmith, Lörmer belongs to the working class of artisans and not the class of artists, who, as we have seen, have come to act as more the bastions of the erudite ideals of the bourgeoisie.[67] Though Lörmer briefly takes the center stage as principal and competent talebearer in the scene set in the cellar of the Capuchin brewery, Mörike's text dismisses his worth at a glance, perfunctorily associating the peg-leg's pockmarked face and dry expression as indicative of a pernicious and 'uncivilized' nature (344).[68] There is no question that the physiognomical dictates of his syphilitic and uncivilized appearance prohibit him from finding any other place in society than – as Nolten later puts it when talking of Larkens's downfall – the *Schlamm* or "filth" of his current circumstances (358). However, his apparent difference is actually the effect of a social function, that is, he is known by the disparity in the degree of aesthetic education that separates artisans from 'civilized' artists such as Nolten or Larkens. Lörmer's disfigurements signify that he is polluted and perhaps infertile, that he is *a deficient man*. Thus difference is recorded by falsely equating the face and body as a natural transparency either of one's wealth or of one's poverty of 'civilization.'

By contrast, the description of Larkens acting under the pseudonym of the carpenter Joseph, which immediately follows the description of Lörmer, points to Joseph's / Larkens's face as an easily legible sign of his civilized manner and that his present company is below his station:

Two men along from [the gunsmith] sat a man of about thirty-six years. No

---

[67] The name "Nolten" originates with Lichtenberg who mentions the death of a gunsmith of that name (Tscherpel 102).

[68] H. Mayer writes that pockmarks were "something detestable to Winckelmann, who praised the Greeks, happy because they were apparently unacquainted with that particular disfigurement" (170-71).

> particularly refined talent of observation was necessary to discover something more meaningful and thoroughly nobler in this figure, in this head, than one would otherwise expect in such a circle. A narrow, somewhat weather-beaten and deeply furrowed face, the inconstant fiery eye, the passionate haste in his gracious movements bore clear witness to unusual storms that the man had probably experienced during his life. He spoke little and mostly looked distractedly down in front of himself.[69]

Claudia Liebrand considers Larkens's mutation as the "pious carpenter Joseph" as just another role played by the actor (110-11; see also Storz 174), whereas Annette Scholl sees parallels "in the aesthetic conceptions and in the concrete modes of expression" of Goethe and Larkens (75). For his part, the narrator is unambiguous in his physiognomical estimation of Joseph's / Larkens's cultural rank: once compared with Lörmer, it is clear that Joseph / Larkens is simply of another class and prejudged as *nobler*.

However, the agility, passions, good manners, and experience displayed by Joseph's / Larkens's face and gestures, which distinguish him from his company of artisans, at the same time strike a curious and troubling pose. There is also an unsettling sense of decline, instability, and urgency about him. While demonstrating 'good breeding,' his figure betrays a lack of restraint unacceptable to the ideal of man and artist. Larkens's greater fidelity with the privileged social classes of the bourgeoisie and aristocracy, evidenced by his many contacts among them, is no guarantee of permanent inclusion among the higher cultural echelons should he not entirely fit the bill. The reader learns that as a young man Larkens demonstrated a ready potential to conform to, even to epitomize, the establishment. During President von K.'s account of the vaudevillian manner in which he became acquainted with Larkens, he describes the comic actor as having "a long, weepy face" and "such a delightful guildsman's look, such a self-justifying toughness ... [a] brow already exhibiting a sense of comfort."[70] Yet something untoward underlies Larkens's artistic mannerisms. Though President von K.'s description is meant favorably, Larkens's features also convey precociousness, perhaps even an overcompensation that gnaw at the suitability and sustainment of Larkens as an exemplary cultural figure. Elsewhere the actor's lean, off-color, and unattractive appearance gives cause for reservation by – perhaps unfairly – confirming a menacing nature: the narrator reports that he is "gaunt" and that "his character was well known, it had unjustifiably earned him the reputation of a nasty mocker and schemer to which sometimes also his outward appearance contributed, inasmuch as a sallow complexion and a pair of black flashing eyes [were] ugly, or the furtive smile about the mouth was dangerous."[71] And the narrator's later reference to Larkens's "severe and angular face"[72] should bring to an end any doubt in the reader's mind as to Larkens's difference from the smooth contours expected from the ideal image of an artist-intellectual. Thus, a subtle, yet decisively negative marking of the face as artificial and antisocial assures that Larkens will never secure full membership to the cultural and social elite in spite of the fact that he is culturally productive throughout Mörike's novel – as an actor, director, author, narrator, and poet. Again, a character's difference is the result of the function of identity: Larkens the former and eventual guildsman is known by the deliberate ambition required of someone of his original station aspiring to the noble heights of the artistic professions. Such a personality trait – as it is located on the face – is neither deemed appropriate to, nor considered necessary for those born into more privileged milieus and for whom such a vocational path would be one of several obvious career choices. The overall narrative of Larkens's face tells an equivocal story: that he is aesthetically gifted and proficient, and that the combination of creative talent with the ability to promote oneself in such a type poses a threat to the proprieties of men of letters. The smugness, yellowishness, and harshness of Larkens's appearance tarnish and overwhelm the few favorable features to indicate that he is *a man of cruelty and little restraint*. His eventual exclusion is thus ascertained by a partisan insistence on the apparent underlying knowledge of the face as the sign either of one's entirely 'natural' or of one's distinctly contrived propensity for aestheticism, that is, the degree to which one's ideal maleness is genuine.

---

[69] "Zwei Mann unter [dem Büchsenmacher] saß ein Mensch von etwa sechsunddreißig Jahren. Es war keine besonders feine Beobachtungsgabe nötig, um in dieser Gestalt, diesem Kopfe etwas Bedeutenderes und durchaus Edleres zu entdecken, als man sonst in einem solchen Kreis erwarten würde. Ein schmales, ziemlich verwittertes und tiefgefurchtes Gesicht, das unstete feurige Auge, eine leidenschaftliche Hast in den anständigen Bewegungen zeugten offenbar von ungewöhnlichen Stürmen, die der Mann im Leben mochte erfahren haben. Er sprach wenig, sah meist zerstreut vor sich nieder" (344).

---

[70] "'ein langes weinerliches Gesicht'" (370); "Eine solche köstliche Zunftmiene, so eine rechtfertige Zähheit ... [eine] Stirne[, die] sich bereits die Behaglichkeit zeichne[t]" (373).

[71] "hager[]" (30); "sein Humor war bekannt genug, er hatte ihn mit Unrecht in den Ruf eines bösartigen Spötters und Intriganten gebracht, wozu mitunter auch sein Äußeres beitrug, sowenig eben eine gelbe Hautfarbe und ein paar schwarze blitzende Augen häßlich, oder das lauernde Lächeln um den Mund gefährlich war" (36).

[72] "schneidend scharfe[s] Gesicht" (152).

The most exhaustive negative stereotyping in *Maler Nolten* is reserved for the itinerant figure of Sigismund [Liebmund Maria] Wispel, whose very nature and apparently implausible identity as the artist of a picture acquired by Count von Zarlin forms the basis of the novel's opening discussion between Baron Jaßfeld and painter Tillsen.[73] Wispel's mien and deportment give cause for consternation in Tillsen's mind. He finds it difficult to believe the stranger's claim of being the originator of an oil painting and a series of sketches. Tillsen first remarks that the artworks are "the product of a madman"[74] and goes on to describe their apparent creator as "a degenerate fellow with a puny build and sickly appearance, a snippety character as thin as a rake."[75] Indeed, the appearance and manner of this "zealous dilettante" – "his dubious behavior" and "muddled talk," "his cloying speech ... and the inappropriate giggling," "his foppish and affected demeanor" – are all taken for the outward signs of "an importunate bletherer," "a rogue," "the rarest example of madness," and a "mysterious fool."[76] Tillsen's portrayal of Wispel declares the unusual figure to be but a shadow of a man, the embodiment of ruin, and hence the very opposite of the standard of an artist as a healthy and attractive male:

---

[73] K. Fischer suggests that Wispel is based on the Ludwigsburg wigmaker Fribolin (123), whereas Tscherpel sees a forerunner to Wispel in Belcampo from E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Die Elixiere des Teufels* (*The Devil's Elixirs*, 1815-16) (97; see also M. Mayer 98) and Jennings tentatively ventures a comparison between the figure and the poet Friedrich Hölderlin ("Suckelborst" 325). Jennings maintains that Wispel is "a projected fragment of Mörike's personality" ("Grotesquery" 613) or a "facet" or "part" of the author ("Suckelborst" 323, 332). For the meaning of "Wispel" in Swabian, see Jennings ("Grotesquery" 610n20); see also Taraba (236).

[74] "Die Werke eines Wahnsinnigen" (16).

[75] "ein verwahrloster Mensch von schwächlicher Gestalt und kränklichem Aussehen, eine spindeldünne Schneiderfigur" (17).

[76] "eifrige[r] Dilettant[] ... die windige Art seines Benehmens, das Verworrene seines Gesprächs" (17); "süßlich wispernde[] Sprache ... und das unpassende Kichern," "sein[] stutzerhaft affektierte[s] Betragen" (18); "ein[] aufdringliche[r] Schwätzer ... ein[] Schelm[]" (17); "das seltenste Beispiel von Verrücktheit" (18); "geheimnisvolle[r] Narr[]" (20).

> "His elegant act of being posh struck a most comical and frightful contrast with his meager exterior: a little, worn-out, light-green coat and a rotten pair of nankeen breeches. One moment he tugged at the nap of his rather unwashed shirt with a dainty finger, the next he bounced his little bamboo cane across his narrow back, all the while pulling at the sleeves of his little green jacket to try to prevent me from noticing the humiliating fact that it was too short for him. All of this aroused my heartfelt sympathy. Did I not have to contemplate a man who had come to ruin with his exceptional talent, perhaps also sick vanity, perhaps by slovenliness, to such an extent that in the end only this miserable shadow remains?"[77]

Already in the very first encounter with Wispel, this curious figure is adorned with the terms of madness, decay, weakness, disease, ugliness, ambiguity, affectation, criminality, mystery, pretension, ridicule, deficiency, and so on. Indeed, from the very beginning, the text imposes upon this itinerant character a physiognomical tyranny designed to hinder even the slightest consideration of his possibly being taken seriously for an artist – try as he may. Any notion of Wispel as a productive artist is rendered inconceivable in the text by the accompaniment of a series of physical and behavioral afflictions that undermine and discredit him from ever assuming such an esteemed role. Wispel's weak physique, verbosity, and overall frilliness prohibit him from legitimately joining the ranks of artists and the cultural elite supposedly distinguishable by their physical and mental vitality, nobility, and restraint. The ensuing discovery of and discussion with Theobald Nolten provides Tillsen with an answer to his doubts as to the authenticity of the strange but apparent sketch artist. The better-looking Nolten – unquestioned as the more *obvious* originator of the sketches – explains:

---

[77] "'Dies elegante Vornehmtun machte mit seinem notdürftigen Außern, einem abgetragenen, hellgrünen Fräckchen und schlechten Nankingbeinkleidern einen höchst komischen, affreusen Kontrast. Bald zupfte er mit zierlichem Finger an seinem ziemlich ungewaschenen Hemdstrich, bald ließ er sein Bambusröhrchen auf dem schmalen Rücken tänzeln, indem er zugleich bemüht war, durch Einziehung der Arme mir die schmähliche Kürze des grünen Fräckchens zu verbergen. Mit alle diesem erregte er meine aufrichtige Teilnahme. Mußt ich mir nicht einen Menschen denken, der mit seinem außerordentlichen Talente, vielleicht auch gekränkte Eitelkeit, vielleicht durch Liederlichkeit, dergestalt in Zerfall geraten war, daß zuletzt nur dieser jämmerliche Schatten übrigbleibt?'" (18).

> "After my return from Italy ... I met ... a milksop, and barber by profession – he went by the name of Wispel – who offered me his services as my valet, and I took him on all the more out of an amusing interest in his peculiarity, since, aside from a – as I call it – universally enthusiastic stroke of the blade, aside from a coiffeur's arrogance, he always demonstrated a certain good-naturedness that eventually was only able to give way to the most obstinate vanity – for I wanted to swear on it, he had at first no other intention with these purloined notions than to play the man before one and all."[78]

The puzzle for Tillsen is resolved by the explanation that Wispel is a barber and man-servant made interesting only by his disorienting, yet innocuous, bent for impersonation and putting on airs and graces. The farcical barber forms a literary tradition that was based in the socially marginalized and often combined figure of hair-dresser, village quack, and army doctor, and that reached its peak in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[79] Typically, such a character has a tall, haggard, and thin physique, and a personality that is marked by a passion for bragging and high-flown speech, cowardliness, impertinence, vanity, weepy sentimentality, and overzealous brotherly affection (Martens 373-74, 376-77, 380). The unusual figure of Wispel who so troubled the old artist – and there is no question that Wispel initially poses a problem for Tillsen – is thus rendered nonthreatening by being categorized with a profession that falls outside the realm of cultural production and that presumably better compliments his manner and appearance in the eyes both of the older and of the younger artist. Indeed, Tillsen and Nolten agree that Wispel is "a wily lad" and a "rogue," and that he was successful with his deception only "by the semblance of being educated" that he had mimicked from Nolten and a friend.[80] Later, after the unmasking of Wispel's second great deception, this time similarly as the impersonation of an Italian artist (84, 94-96), the narrator returns to describing him "with his usual affectation, with his dainty cough and his little winks."[81] Nolten and Count von Zarlin believe that "the contemptible creature" and "wretched sinner" "was cursed with some disease"; even Constanze considers him "a poor madman."[82]

---

[78] "'Nach meiner Rückkehr aus Italien, ... traf ich ... einen Hasenfuß, Barbier seiner Profession – er nannte sich Wispel –, der mir seine Dienste als Bedienter antrug, und ich nahm ihn aus einem humoristischen Interesse an seiner Seltsamkeit um so lieber auf, da er neben einem, daß ich so sage, universal-enthusiastischen Hieb, neben einem badermäßigen Hochmut, immer eine gewisse Gutmütigkeit zeigte, die in der Folge nur der borniertesten Eitelkeit weichen konnte; denn so wollt ich darauf schwören, er hatte mit jenen entwendeten Konzepten anfangs keine andere Absicht, als vor Ihnen den Mann zu machen'" (22).

[79] See Martens (371, 374). This transnational literary tradition begins with the figure of Assamit in the *Thousand and One Nights* and continues in Germany with various characters in numerous comedies, novels, and stories especially since the eighteenth century that include works by Hans Jacob Christoph Grimmelshausen, Ludwig Holberg, Johann Joachim Schwabe, Christoph Martin Wieland, Johann Karl August Musäus, Goethe, Ernst Theodor Amadeus Hoffmann, Joseph von Eichendorff, Franz August von Kurländer, Mörike, Georg Büchner, Friedrich Hebbel, Thomas Mann, and Ernst Toller (374-80).

The tyranny of physiognomical and sartorial negative stereotyping of Wispel remains unabating whenever he appears in the novel. Starring as "Wispel" the Printer's associate in Larkens's shadow play,[83] he is described by the Annealer as having a "face like soap and slimy eyes [that] are always squinting"; the Blacksmith confirms this adding: "and, year in, year out, he wears a short little coat from Nanking, as he calls it, and grass-green breeches that don't even reach as far as his ankles, but he treats you so daintily and swishily as if made of sugar, and blows away each and every speck of dust from his sleeves."[84] When Wispel arrives on stage the directions read "completely with affectation," and, due to the rotten state of his teeth, he admits that he has "a diction that very much commends [him] particularly among women."[85] Wispel is concerned with his appearance, using lard to grease his hair (132) and cultivating "little curls on his forehead."[86]

---

[80] "ein abgefeimter Bursche," "Schurke," "durch den Schein eigener Bildung"(23).

[81] "mit seiner gewohnten Affektation, mit jenem Hüsteln und Blinzeln" (97).

[82] "der verächtlichen Kreatur," "dem ärmlichen Sünder" (98); "wie mit einer Krankheit gestraft war" (97); "einen armen Verrückten" (98).

[83] Hickman reports that Goethe "wrote scripts for shadow plays" (70).

[84] "GLASBRENNER ... Sein Gesicht ist wie Seife und er blinzelt immer aus triefigen Augen. / SCHMIED Ja, und er trägt jahraus jahrein ein knappes Fräcklein aus Nanking, wie er's nennt, und grasgrüne Beinkleider, die ihm nicht bis an die Knöchel reichen, aber er tut euch doch so zierlich und schnicklich, wie von Zucker und bläst sich jedes Stäubchen vom Ärmel weg"(129-30).

[85] "*Durchaus mit Affektation*"; "eine Diktion, die mich besonders bei den Damen sehr empfehlen muß" (131).

[86] "kleine Löckchen ... auf der Stirn" (134).

The descriptive physiognomical assault on Wispel continues unabashedly during the scene in the cellar of the Capuchin brewery. Lörmer promises to tell a tale concerning "a scamp," his "little appendix," or "little tail" (or "little prick"), who is immediately recognized enthusiastically by his audience of boon companions as "the figure! the figure!"[87] The gunsmith's elaborate description makes "the spindly, anemic creature," the "affectionate barber Sigismund Wispel" appear both precious and monstrous:

> "A number of curious habits, the tiring meticulousness with which he rubs and pampers his mite-infested skin, or bastes his ginger hair with all kinds of dirty grease, or cuts and scrapes his nails until they bleed – I am paralyzed with sickness at the mere thought of it! And when he purses his lips so sweetly and winks his eye because, as he is given to saying, his eyelashes are in poor health, or when he snuggles up to me with his thousand caresses and gestures, how my stomach turns. These 'manifestations of friendship' have more than once caused me to fling him like a feeble little fairy against the wall ... Perhaps you're not aware that the fellow has genuine webbed skin on his hands and feet, especially between his toes; and I'm quite convinced that his limbs would yield nothing but the meager little sticks of fishbones instead of [human] bones, and that in any case you would find out the strangest things about him."[88]

Again Wispel is described in the terms of dirt and disease, an overattentive concern for his appearance, affectation, effeminacy, and weakness. Furthermore, this time he is lent a bestial nature. And it is interesting that Lörmer, himself not highly ranked in the conditions of culture, should have become the venomous mouthpiece of Wispel's censure. Sanctioned by his audience's encouragement, the deficient man Lörmer passes judgment on Wispel who *for some reason* is so low down on the scale of humanity that he is no man at all, but rather half-man-half-fish or some kind of reptilian being. After introducing Wispel in this way, Lörmer reveals the riddle of his story:

---

[87] "ein[] Lump[]," "Anhängsel," "Schwänzchen" (346); "die Figur! die Figur!" (347). The double meaning of "Schwänzchen" should not be lost on the reader.

[88] "das spindeldünne bleichsüchtige Wesen," "zärtliche[r] Barbier, Sigismund Wispel[]," "'Eine Menge kurioser Angewohnheiten, eine ermüdliche Sorgfalt, seine Milbenhaut zu reiben und zu hätscheln, seine rötliche Haare mit allerlei gemeinem Fette zu beträufeln, seine Nägel bis aufs Blut zu schneiden und zu schaben – ich bekomme Gichter beim bloßen Gedanken! und wenn er nun die Lippen so süß zuspitzt und mit den Augen blinzt, weil er, wie er zu sagen pflegt, an der Wimper kränkelt, oder wenn er sich mit den tausend Liebkosungen und Gesten an mich anschmiegt, da dreht sich der Magen in mir um und ich hab ihn wegen dieser Freundschaftsbezeugungen mehr als einmal wie einen Flederwisch an die Wand fliegen lassen ... Vielleicht ist euch nicht bekannt, daß der Kerl an Händ und Füßen, besonders aber zwischen den Zehen, wirkliche Schwimmhäute hat, auch lebe ich der festen Überzeugung, man würde aus seinen Gliedmaßen lauter schmale Stäbe von Fischbein, statt der Knochen, ziehen und überhaupt die wunderbarsten Dinge bei ihm entdecken'" (347).

> "Yesterday morning, however, he got out of bed particularly early; I was still lying half-asleep with my eyes closed, but my mind had to follow each gesture the repulsive creature made while getting dressed, each expression, no, I should say more fittingly, each extravagant twist of his face he pulled over and over again while washing ... and then I heard him put his bony fingers on the table and crack them that the walls rang, the usual maneuver by which he tries to wake me up and get me to talk, and he lisps: 'Good morning, brother! Did you sleep well?' But I do not stir. He repeats his greeting a few more times without success; finally I feel two ice-cold fingertips holding my nose ... My astonishment alone was great when I saw the dirty dog standing in the corner in a new black coat with a fashionably high necktie and a superb weave of shirt. The faded nankeen breeches and the worn-out shoes so familiar to me did still testify to yesterday and the day before yesterday, but the remaining splendor, how did that come by such a scoundrel? ... and to this day I still haven't solved the riddle. The scoundrel must also have ready money; he spoke of an indemnification, of a board allowance and the like"[89]

---

[89] "'Gestern morgen aber stand er ungewöhnlich früh vom Bette auf; ich lag noch halbschlafend mit geschlossenen Augen, mußte aber im Geist jede Gebärde verfolgen, die der Widerwart während des Ankleidens machte, jede Miene, nein, ich sage passender, jeden Gesichtsschnörkel, der sich während des Waschens zwanzig- und dreißigfältig bei ihm formierte ... jetzt hört ich ihn seine beinernen Finger auf den Tisch setzen und knackend abdrucken, daß die Wände gellten, das gewöhnliche Manöver, wodurch er mich zum Erwachen, zum Gespräch zu bringen sucht, und: "Guten Morgen, Bruder! wie schlief sich's" lispelt er, aber ich rühre mich nicht. Er wiederholt den Gruß noch einigemal, ohne Erfolg; endlich fühle ich meine Nase zärtlich von zwei eiskalten Fingerspitzen gehalten ... Allein wie groß war mein Erstaunen, als ich den Hundsfott im neuen schwarzen Frack, mit neumodisch hoher Halsbinde und süperbem Hemdstrich in der Ecke stehen sah. Die mir wohlbekannte verblichene Hose aus Nanking und die abgenutzten Schuhe zeugten zwar noch von gestern und ehegestern, aber die übrige Pracht, woher kam sie an solchen Schuft? ... noch heute ist mir das Rätsel nicht gelöst. Der Schuft muß auch bare Münze haben; er sprach von einer Schadloshaltung, von einem Kostgeld und dergleichen'" (348).

Certainly, to the modern reader, the purchasing or otherwise of new items of clothing may not seem to warrant the extreme negative portrayal of Wispel that precedes the heart of Lörmer's story. Yet Wispel's improved sartorial circumstances are regarded with nothing but surprise and suspicion. Perhaps Wispel's change out of his usual green jacket and into a more fashionable black one so disturbs Lörmer since the black jacket would actually make the curious figure of Wispel blend in among respectable citizens. In the early 1800s, the apparel of frauds and swindlers often contrasted with the clothes worn by members of the permanently settled population. As "wanted" posters from late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century southern Germany show, there was a predilection among tricksters for roughly the type of individualistic getup Wispel usually wears or is wearing in Mörike's charcoal drawing of him: round-brimmed hats, a black silk neckcloth (often with a white neckcloth worn underneath), predominantly blue or green jackets, an inclination for buttons, and predominantly yellow trousers – from an assortment of materials including nankeen (originally a durable cotton from China) (see Seidenspinner, "Jaunertracht").[90] In and of themselves the color and style of the clothes are less puzzling to the gunsmith than their newness and smartness. Nor does he yet know that Wispel has revealed Joseph / Larkens's whereabouts for money. What disconcerts Lörmer, and remains as yet unresolved, is exactly the significant, albeit partial, improvement in Wispel. Lörmer is nonplused by how anyone so debased can suddenly seem so smart, how anyone can appear to be something others – his peers, but not his equals – deem him not to be. Indeed, Lörmer begins his story promising, but eventually never manages, to reveal how Wispel "has ingratiated himself as a smart-looking fellow within twenty-four hours."[91] Just as when he appeared as a sketch artist, as the Italian artist, or in the role of "Wispel" the Printer's associate in Larkens's play – all occupations directly related to the culture business – Wispel's own choice of professional categories for himself is very much at odds with how others perceive and would classify him.

---

[90] Mörike's drawing of Wispel even resembles the faces of the con men portrayed on these "wanted" posters, especially the Schimen and Jessel twins posted in Mainz in 1803 (281). See also Tscherpel for the connection between Larkens and the physiognomics of "wanted" posters (128-29).

[91] "sich ... innerhalb vierundzwanzig Stunden zum flotten Mann poussiert hat" (346).

This visual divergence is mediated at a discursive physiognomical level in which those who give voice or add words to their perceptions of another's appearance, even in the form of gossip, gain leverage over the position that person may occupy in society; even lay physiognomists are more than capable of asserting a relation of difference to their own advantage and the other's disadvantage. In this instance, Lörmer, the narrator, and Larkens practically collude to put Wispel in his place.

On Wispel's arrival in the beer cellar the narrator takes over from Lörmer to describe the efforts made by "the elegant barber Wispel" (the epithet is an oxymoron) to have his new appearance noted and acknowledged: "He hovered about for a while nobly clearing his throat in the entrance room, smoothed down his short curly hair in front of the mirror, and squinted at our party in passing"; and after sitting down at an adjacent table "He sipped affectedly from a goblet of schnapps, cast conspicuous glances about him, clanked his knife on his plate, and made every attempt to draw attention to himself."[92] The gunsmith changes the topic of conversation to "Jocó the Brazilian ape" about whom Joseph / Larkens remarks: "'But he [the ape] is supposed to have run away. It is presumed that he has misappropriated a theater wardrobe of one thing and another, shaved his face and hands, and, thus, completely unrecognizable, has decided to inspect the world a little'"[93] Forming a ludicrous parallel with Wispel's situation, Larkens's aside is clearly aimed at the curious figure suggesting that he is just as much a freak in his own aspiration to become a man of the world. This grotesque reference is not unlike Lörmer's earlier description of Wispel as a webbed monster since, regarded comparable to an orangutan who has to rid his face and hands of hair to pass as human, he is once again made to appear only as civilized or as sophisticated as an animal. By casting him in the same light as a bestial physiognomy – and, for that matter, as foreign – Wispel is categorized as practically unhuman. By thus composing a most derogatory form of physiognomical narrative about Wispel in which his outward appearance signifies a bestial nature, Mörike's text not only shows how one group of men are able to ostracize a particular individual from their circle, it also sets up in the physiognomically informed mind of the reader the stigma necessary to exclude Wispel from the realm of cultivated men, perhaps even to banish him from the ranks of humanity altogether. Wispel's censure is thorough and pandemic. At this point, Konrad the coachman recognizes Wispel by "the windbag's high-flown clichés," and later he finds him with Agnes and Nannette in Nolten's room "lisping with mysterious preciosity"[94] and resorting to a profusion of French expressions.[95]

---

[92] "der elegante Barbier Wispel"; "Er schwebte einigemal vornehm hüstelnd in der vordern Stube auf und ab, strich sich den Titus vor dem Spiegel und schielte im Vorübergehen nach unserer Gesellschaft" (351); "Er nippte zimpferlich aus einem Kelche Schnaps, warf wichtige Blicke umher, klimperte mit dem Messer auf dem Teller und suchte sich auf alle Art bemerklich zu machen" (352).

[93] "Joko, de[r] brasilianische[] Affe[]"; "'aber [der Affe] soll sich flüchtig gemacht haben; man vermutet, daß er einer Theatergarderobe ein und anderes entwendet, sich Gesicht und Hände rasiert und so, gänzlich unkennbar, beschlossen habe, sich die Welt ein wenig zu mustern'" (352).

As someone who has only tenuous or fleeting relationships, Wispel's role in other people's lives is casual, unstable, and inconsistent. Nolten picks him up in Italy as a man-servant. Similarly, later he is in the temporary employ of an Italian artist as an interpreter. All Lörmer knows when taking him in is that Wispel has followed the peg-leg from Hamburg in order to find consolation in his arms for the death of his recent short-term business associate the Printer Murschel. (The story of "Professor" Wispel and Printer Murschel is recounted in the "Wispeliaden" ["Wispeliana"] under the title "Wispel auf Reisen" ["Wispel on His Travels," 1834(?)], *Werke* 780-82.) It is this social function or identity of an indeterminable traveler or itinerant that is at the root of the inscription of Wispel's facial, bodily, and behavioral difference. Indeed, for economic reasons, by the beginning of modernity, society had become less inclined to tolerate the free movement of people and considered permanent settlement a part of human nature and, thus, a cultural norm (see Seidenspinner, "Mobilität" 159). The itinerant or vagrant became stock terms under which people from various diverse backgrounds and trades could be lumped together with a single identity as outsiders (164). Thus, the transient is known paradoxically by his incognizance, by imprecision or the difficulty to locate him in a fixed category, by his unpredictable and ever-changing or motley manner. Such a perception of the itinerant as beyond familiar or 'normal' categories necessarily subscribes barber Wispel's face and body in order to subjugate them as the representation of a physical, mental, and, even, sexual disposition that deviates from and contrasts the perceived norm (cf. Liebrand 113; cf. Martens 366). Wispel's facial contortions and makeup, his scrawniness and shabby or unflatteringly eccentric outfits, his gestures and extravagant parlance, are the physiognomical and sartorial topoi of a literary and cultural trope of the day that expressly limit the articulation of his nature and social standing as that of a barber and con artist. He is a *cheeky monkey* or a *queer fish*. It is insinuated that he is, what is to be termed by the end of the nineteenth century, a "homosexual."

---

[94] "die hochtrabenden Floskeln des Windbeutels" (352); "mit geheimnisvoller Preziosität zu lispeln" (353).

[95] Wispel's use of especially French expressions (97, 132, 135-36, 353, 357) emphasizes his foreignness as well as his identity as a barber. It may also add to the sense of his effeminacy (cf. Zantop 28).

When Wispel makes his best effort to present himself as the visual representation of a sophisticated man, it becomes imperative among his peers to describe him in derogatory terms. He is their definition of an outsider, and it is to their advantage that he remain so. The tyrannical rhetoric of affectation, effeminacy, foreignness, and bestiality – the homophobic discursive markers of homosexuality – conspire to form an impenetrable barrier so contrary in nature to the hegemonic standard of the male aesthetic ideal and its constitutive or instructive role as the sign of *Bildung* that Wispel must be precluded from ever being recognized as a genuine *Kulturtyp* (aesthete). Instead, he is *ein verwahrloster Mensch, eine Schneiderfigur, ein bleichsüchtiges Wesen, ein Wahnsinniger, ein Dilettant, ein aufdringlicher Schwätzer, ein Schelm, ein Hasenfuß, ein abgefeimter Bursche, ein Schurke, eine verächtliche Kreatur, ein ärmlicher Sünder, ein Verrückter, ein Lump, ein Anhängsel, ein Schwänzchen, ein Flederwisch, ein Widerwart, ein Hundsfott, ein Schuft, ein Affe*, and *ein Windbeutel* – all terms connoting a sodomite.[96] Certainly there is a degree of camp sexual inuendo in the sword measuring and sword raising ot the burlesque challenge to a duel issued to Nolten by Wispel when disguised as the Italian artist (95). Moreover, the allusion to sodomy in the privy in the final scene of "Wispel auf Reisen" should leave no doubt in the reader's mind as to the sexual nature of Wispel's relationship with Printer Murschel (*Werke*

---

[96] Mörike uses the words "Affe" and "Windbeutel" in his correspondence when referring to the Saxon Philologist Johannes Minckwitz who had come to the defense of the 'pederast' August von Platen in his public argument with Heinrich Heine (Derks 584n442). In Mörike's poem "Märchen vom sichern Mann" (Mörike, *Werke* 57-65), the sodomizing devil is referred to as "an ape" ("ein Aff'" 64).

782; cf. Jennings, "Grotesquery" 608-09).[97] Queers are not tolerated in the culture industry. It is immaterial whether Wispel is the originator of the sketches, knows as much about sculpture as the Italian artist he impersonates, is a convincing actor when he plays himself on stage, or even cares for the collector's item the Printer has discovered. Wispel is excluded by particularly physiognomical knowledge informed by the function or prejudice of his itinerant and, therefore, sexually 'deviant' identity. As a figment of literary imagination, he has no option but to play both literal and figurative turncoat. Indeed, he cheats Nolten, tricks Tillsen, perhaps does away with Murschel, and probably betrays Joseph / Larkens. Each time, his actions are designed to acquire a new look and so access cultural and economic privileges.

Wispel's exclusion from the workings of the cultural community has nothing to do with potential cultural production or marketable skills; it has everything to do with appearance, that is, class, gender, and sexuality.[98] Just as Lörmer and Larkens before him, Wispel has *the wrong face*. None of them meet the requirements of the male aesthetic ideal so essential to be considered as a member of the cultural community. Indeed, received physiognomical practice orchestrated by cultural producers seizes upon the artisan Lörmer's physical disfigurements as an inarguable external sign of his deficiency as a diseased man in order to make his exclusion from the realm of cultural producers appear natural and justifiable. Similarly, the sharpness of the guildsman Larkens's face asserts a precocity and overeagerness out of line with the standard of the restrained (male) nature of the rightful artist. Likewise, the string of affectations and repulsions about the classless Wispel maintain his deviance from 'mankind' and bar him from playing any acknowledged part in the field of culture. The technology of physiognomical description impinges on these three men physiognomical identities that counter the male aesthetic ideal. That is, in a concurringly physical and intellectual way, they are each found to be somehow lacking in manliness. According to discursive practices and the standard of the manly genius, it is impossible to be the shadow of a man and at the same time civilized.

---

[97] Even Mörike's charcoal drawing of Wispel depicts the figure holding his cane with the knob to his lips in a manner suggesting fellatio (see 461). Also curious is the image on the title page of Wispel's nonsense poems "Sommersprossen" ("Freckles," 1837) that depicts his arrest in – of all places – the Stuttgart Hofgarten by the gatekeeper for digging up the tulips (see image in Fischer 124).

[98] Tscherpel sees reflections of the anarchism of the French Revolution in Wispel's language use and treatment (136-38). An economic factor also plays a role. Money is certainly a motivation for Wispel's actions. He is shrouded with suspicion whenever it comes to finances. But any 'evidence' is circumstantial and one-sided. Nonetheless, going by what we have so far, it appears that particularly queer figures constitute a criminal risk to the prevalent order of the circulation of money between men. Unfortunately, this fiscal aspect of power relations between heterosexuals and homosexuals falls beyond the scope of this project.

Physiognomy and, by analogy, the regulation of the symbolic realm of the influential artist and intellectual together fulfill a masculinist agenda. Indeed, physiognomy is a discursive system that acts in the interests of certain men, those men who apparently most uphold the very male ideal of man, by regarding the aesthetic qualities of men per se. In this way, a select group of authoritative men are able to assert their apparent right to intellectual authority. As I will continue to show using the example of the deft portrayal of artists circles in Mörike's novel, this hegemony of male artists and intellectuals, which to its own amusement is best represented by its newest find of Theobald Nolten, maintains its grip on symbolic power by functioning according to a dynamic that permits only like-appearing men – men who physically resemble the aesthetic ideal – to join its ranks. The foundation of this dynamic is homoerotic – it relies on male same-sex attraction. Quite literally, a handsome young man such as Theobald Nolten need only make an appearance to be regarded as unmistakably comprising true intellectual promise. His role is already sketched out before him: Nolten remarks how Tillsen's painting of the drawing he has obtained from Wispel has captured his very essence, "A wretch had to steal my image so that you would have the opportunity to reveal to me the true, the future figure of myself in your clear reflection."[99]

In my analysis of *Maler Nolten* so far, I have shown how the access to recognition and authority in the realm of art and culture as depicted in the novel is assisted by a commonplace and matter-of-fact adherence to physiognomy. Characters of different gender, but also of different ethnicity or social class, are arranged in an asymmetric power structure that is replicated and endorsed by popular readings of the features of the face as an apparent index of human nature and social aptitude. Physiognomy readily sustains such an asymmetry in the manner in which it confers prestige or restrictions upon the various individuals in vocational relations. The motivation for such pseudoscientific adjudications is largely supplied by the sociocultural dictum of a male aesthetic ideal that originates in the work of Winckelmann and is essentially duplicated by Lavater. Both Winckelmann's theory of ideal art and Lavater's physiognomical pronouncements on ideal human nature are sustained by a male homospectatorial gaze. In Mörike's work, those male individuals whose faces and bodies come the closest to conforming to the principle of a male aesthetic ideal (as the sign of *Bildung*), that is, good-looking and able-bodied men, are attributed, by the physiognomizing narrator and characters, with exemplary natures that signal the worth of such appealing men and provide for their approval as producers and keepers of cultural ventures. Likewise, those women who most typify a similar notion of the standard of feminine beauty – as the sign of a subservient nature – are recognized as the appropriate facilitators of male (artistic) striving. These male and female bearers of what can be called, respectively, *ephebic* or *angelic* good looks tend to be people whose identities or social backgrounds indicate that they are identical to, closely related to, or would entirely conform to the attitudes of those already regarded as established rightful occupants of positions of sociopolitical or symbolic power. The title-figure Theobald Nolten is the primary example of just such an appealing and malleable young man. Other men and women, particularly those of non-German ethnicity or from rural, artisan, or attendant class backgrounds, are assigned more peculiarly unappealing or negatively encoded facial and bodily traits such as darkness, masculine features among women, the scars of disease, haggardness, literal fishiness, or foppishness and feminine features among men. These marks are selected to denote either unrestraint, madness and melancholy, weakness, inhumanness, or, specifically, 'deviance.' The character of Sigismund Wispel most explicitly bears the marks of such negative stereotyping. Such negative features serve as the apparent physiognomical proof of the kind of human natures that are generally upheld as unconducive to the cultural advancement of society and that subsequently warrant the exclusion of those who exhibit them from any position of influence. They thereby contribute to the struggle in the field of cultural production to draw boundaries within humanity, or more specifically among the peoples of German-speaking lands, between those who are entitled to take an active part in the business of art and culture and those who are not. Indeed, it is in pursuit of the underlying motivation for this divide, revealed by my analysis of its moorings in influential physiognomical assertions on the nature of artists, which are in the first instance notably homoaffective and yet ultimately astoundingly homophobic, that I shall devote the concluding section of this chapter.

---

[99] "Ein Elender mußte mich bestehlen, damit Sie Gelegenheit hätten, mir in Ihrem klaren Spiegel meine wahre, meine künftige Gestalt zu zeigen" (22).

VI.

Kevin Parker points out that the much extolled prodemocratic stance of Winckelmann's *History of Ancient Art* favors only certain – bourgeois-liberal – men "at the expense of women, the uncapitaled and non-Europeans" (536). Similarly, my inspection of the use of physiognomical knowledge to ascertain the rightful artist in Mörike's *Maler Nolten* has revealed that those segments of society barred from entry into the powerful domain of intellectuals include women, ethnic non-Germans, the lower-middle and working classes, the bodily impaired, and the queer. Viewed in Foucauldian terms, such discursive lines drawn about the specter of the face can only serve and preserve an existing hegemony of acknowledged men of letters. Certainly, physiognomy – the sociopsychological information convened by the assumed representationality of outward appearances – plays a key part in the world of art since it presides over all aspirants as the preset terms either of their rightful entry or of their obvious exclusion. Operating solely in the interests of men, physiognomy enacts the male gaze over all faces and bodies, measuring them according to the proposed superior standard of a male aesthetic ideal. Such tactics of surveillance control not only the relations of power between men and women, but particularly those between different men. The male gaze of art and intellectual authority, which surveys the populace in search of the desirable signs of aesthetic genius, is especially interested in the faces, bodies, and body language of other men. But this does not mean that all men have the physical right to don smock or gown. As demonstrated in the contrast between Nolten and Wispel – respectively, "a well-dressed young man" with "a very promising and remarkably pleasant physiognomy" (20) and "a degenerate fellow with a puny build and sickly appearance, a snippety character as thin as a rake" (17) – or between Nolten and Larkens – "[Nolten] looked nonetheless still healthy and cheery enough next to his gaunt companion, the actor Larkens" (30) – some men are defined in terms of good looks and are promoted as ideal cultured citizens, others are allocated deficient, cruel, or queer looks and cast out as countertypes or relegated as unfit for the responsibilities and privileges of civilized society.

In a system where men of authority desire the exclusive company of men, their aesthetically sensitive physiognomical observations often insinuate among men of an undesirable class the presence of 'dubious' sexuality. Just as various restrictions are placed on the entire gender of women (see esp. Bohnengel) – or for that matter, the entire race of Gypsies – by the contrived notion of their unfathomable or unrestrained sexuality as evidenced by the face, limitations on or boundaries to power and influence are set within the realm of homosocial desire that are sustained by the indications of and prejudices against masculine infertility (= Lörmer) and, particularly, homosexuality (= Larkens and Wispel). In the conniving spheres of men, faces, and cultural production, sexuality serves as a point of leverage with which to assert the predominance of the patriarch as the representative ideal form of human wit and superior standard of human nature. It is in light of the desire of men of letters for the exclusive company of men, which at the same time excludes apparently unmanly or queer men by insisting on their physiognomical inferiority or countertendency to the ideal image of youthful masculinity, that I believe it is critically exigent to locate physiognomy, as well as the general field of cultural production in German-speaking lands in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, on Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's theoretical continuum of male homosocial desire. Only the observation of such a structure can begin to account for the forms taken by systems of knowledge that seem ultimately to confirm the exclusive occupation of power positions in society by men. In *Between Men. English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*, Sedgwick examines the exclusively male desire at the foundations of the friendships, affiliations, and rivalries between men depicted in English-language novels from the mid-eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century. The starting point of her investigation is the observation of the contrasting nature of the continuum of male relations and the continuum of female relations. She remarks that whereas an argument can be made for the analogy between women-acting-in-the-interests-of-women and women-loving women, whereby the continuum of female-to-female relations is unbroken, the same cannot be said of men-acting-in-the-interests-of-men and men-loving men. Sedgwick maintains that in the modern era the perception of any continuum between social bonds among men and male homosexuality is rendered impossible, that there is a discontinuity between the spheres of male-male erotic and sexual matters and the world of all-male social, economic, or political alliances (1-3). It is never Sedgwick's intention to posit that a homosexual erotic actually secretly underlies all male-male relationships. Rather, she asserts that the notion of homosexual desire is a tactic used to evaluate and distinguish the nature of relations between men (2). Her basic tenet is that homosocial desire uses the threat of homosexuality as a means to divide and conquer from within the establishment of male alliances, friendships, and associations. The hint of homosexuality – the horror and loathing of it – may be employed strategically as a "tool" of oppression or censure to regulate the power positions adopted by men in all kinds of important agreements or associations with the express intention of preserving the male domination of those affairs in the hands of a concentrated few (115). Sedgwick thus recognizes an exclusively male-oriented social mechanism that affects the power structures both between men and of men over women (87). Indeed, patriarchy makes use of homophobia as much as it requires heterosexuality in order to maintain its economic and political might (3-4). In this way, by indicating the discontinuity between male homosociality and male homosexuality, Sedgwick is able to investigate the affect of sexuality on power relations. It is with such discoveries in mind that I analyze further the nature of the physiognomical operations guiding the relations between the male artist-intellectuals in Mörike's *Maler Nolten*. At the very heart of some of the physiognomies on display in the novel are observations and aspersions that implicitly concern sexuality and that assist both the association and the division of men.

The art world of Mörike's *Maler Nolten* is comprised of male-male relations. On first inspection, these relations form a continuity in the sense that they are all connected through and about Theobald Nolten. Nolten is the common denominator in the concerns of all the men in the novel who act in the interests of men when assisting and directing the younger man's artistic career since, having figured him not only as one of their own but also as a potential example of an ideal of their kind, they at once promote themselves. The specific forms of male-male relations in Mörike's text range in nature from familial relationships, friendship and fraternity, collegial partnerships, professional or business liaisons, the ties of patronage or employed service, to the bonds of love and affection, cuckoldry, rivalry, and erotic or sexual interests; thus from male-bonding to male-male sexual desire. To begin with, there are those male figures who are in some way related to its protagonist. Nolten considers himself to have three 'fathers': his birth father, Agnes's Father, and Baron von Neuburg (333). Along with Neuburg, the painter Tillsen and President von K. constitute those members of the elder generation who serve as professional mentors and guides to Nolten. Tillsen is perhaps accreditable for officially discovering Nolten. President von K. takes Nolten under his wing and into his home after Larkens's death. Larkens is undoubtedly the most influential character from Nolten's own generation: they are affectionate friends, confidants, artistic collaborators, and even partners in crime. Leopold and his traveling companion Ferdinand as well as Raymund make up the remainder of Nolten's immediate peer group. Furthermore, Wispel is no mere hireling to Nolten. He is also a chosen source of companionship and amusement as well as the cause of some embarrassment and the bane of Nolten's existence.[100] For a while, Duke Adolf is Nolten's patron and romantic rival for the attentions of Constanze. Nolten finds a further rival, this time for Agnes's hand, in the figure of her cousin Otto Lienhart. And though the old Privy Councillor keeps a watchful and critical distance from Nolten – their relations are strained at times (29-30) – he is intrinsic to the younger man's career development. Together with Tillsen, the Privy Councillor arranges for a "secretive" private undertaking for Nolten and Raymund with an unspecified northern German Prince (327), and in a letter at the end of the novel reveals himself as Theobald Nolten's long-lost artist-uncle Friedrich Nolten.

These guardians, friends, associates, and acquaintances of Nolten are also connected to one another in ways that are at once still concerned with the protagonist and yet independent from him. For instance, Nolten's servant Wispel is connected to Larkens through the Printer Murschel, who like Wispel appears in Larkens's play, and Lörmer, with whom Wispel at one point shares a room, and who is one of Larkens's (Joseph's) drinking-comrades in the Capuchin cellar. Larkens is further linked to Wispel as the most likely candidate for the friend of Nolten's whom it is said Wispel imitates in order to give the appearance of being learned during his deception of Tillsen (23). Again, Wispel and Larkens find themselves depicted in each other's company during President von K.'s account of his making the actor's acquaintance. While Larkens ("a long, weepy face") is clambering through the President's theater box, surely no one other than Wispel – with his fondness for fabric, links to Italy, and constant need for cash – can be meant by the figure of "a shop assistant" among the audience "'standing *lisping* to a young woman: "Bulk Naples lace?"'" (my emphasis).[101] Nolten's friend Larkens is also connected to President von K., the Privy Councillor, Agnes's Father (by correspondence), Count von Zarlin, and Leopold and Ferdinand. The Privy Councillor is connected to Leopold and Ferdinand – both friends of Nolten from their time together in Italy, and both acquainted with Agnes's Father and Neuburg (31) – as well as Count von Zarlin, the painter Tillsen, and Raymund. In turn, Tillsen is connected with the art lover Zarlin, Duke Adolf, and Baron Jaßfeld. And so the connections proceed. Indeed, many of the above relationships or cliques formed between men are actively pursued by all parties involved and are often openly acknowledged and clearly distinguishable as to the form they take. Some are based on the event of being drawn to another's face (such as those between Tillsen and Nolten, Nolten and Wispel, Nolten and Neuburg, and President von K. and Larkens). Other connections come to light only after some delay on the part of the narrative, or they are generally kept under wraps and can be deduced mainly by speculation (or from the clues of brief descriptions of faces and mannerisms, as is the case with the extent of the relationship between Larkens and Wispel). Almost all of the interpersonal relations between men can be regarded in varying and overlapping ways. Indeed, while based in the common concern of male interests, the various male-male relations in the novel form a network of vying factions or self-promoting individuals about the protagonist.

---

[100] Jennings maintains that Wispel "appears as the symbolic representative of death" ("Grotesquery" 609; see also Hausdörfer 262, 263; Horstmann 280; Schüpfer 31).

---

[101] "'steht ein Ladendiener vor einem Fräulein und lispelt: "Gros de Naples-Band?"'" (370).

These relations involving and surrounding Nolten take on all forms and often there is a blurring of the definitional lines that otherwise distinguish one type of relation from another. Ties, pacts, bonding, affection, and erotic interest – that is, business and pleasure – are combined. Indeed, within this male-oriented system of cultural production, male desire circulates readily. There are hints at several moments that the relations pertaining particularly to Nolten are not always simply concerned with straight business. As certain turns of phrase and enthusiastic reactions to faces indicate, several of Nolten's closest alliances appear primarily to be founded on the grounds of affection and desire. Especially Larkens is described as having an affectionate attachment to his friend whom he even addresses with the expression "dear cloverleaf!"[102] While Nolten and Larkens are incarcerated, the narrator explains that "a boundless longing for Nolten overcame (*übermannte*) Larkens" on hearing "the lock to his *beloved*'s cell rattle" (my emphasis).[103] The narrator again uses no uncertain terms when describing the depth of affection shown between the two men on being reunited after their acquittal. This episode takes place while Nolten is ill in bed: "Never before had a more passionate friendship been seen. And if otherwise Larkens practiced the avoidance of every appearance of sentimentality almost to the point of cruelty, so he could not at this moment embrace and kiss the unwell Nolten enough."[104] Later when preparing for an unannounced trip abroad, Larkens has trouble "concealing an intense state of agitation" at the thought of leaving Nolten, and even confesses his love in a farewell letter to his friend: "O, I cannot think what I will lose with you, exquisite boy! But quiet. You know how I have cherished you in my heart, just as I know your love well."[105] In fact, Larkens must stand alongside Agnes and Constanze as one of Nolten's three adulthood loves (cf. Immerwahr, "Loves" 74). On his trip to Neuburg, Nolten takes with him three objects of personal symbolic value: a lock of Agnes's hair, Constanze's gift to Agnes of a precious collar, and, next to his heart, Larkens's farewell or love letter (282; cf. 331 for Nolten's divided affections for Agnes and two unspecified others). Wispel even describes the relationship between Nolten and Larkens by alluding to Castor and Pollux, twins known for their brotherly affection (353).

---

[102] "liebes Kleeblatt!" (30). The German word can be used figuratively to mean a "threesome" and "genitals."

[103] "eine unbegrenzte Sehnsucht nach Theobald übermannte [Larkens] ... und drüben hörte er das Schloß zum Zimmer des Geliebten rauschen" (198).

[104] "Nie hatte man eine leidenschaftlichere Freundschaft gesehen, und wenn sonst Larkens die Vermeidung jeden Anscheins vom Empfindsamkeit beinahe bis zur Härte trieb, so ward er jetzt nicht satt, den Kranken zu umarmen und zu küssen" (234).

[105] "eine heftige Bewegung" (250); "O ich darf nicht denken, was ich mit Dir verliere, herrlicher Junge! Aber still; Du weißt, wie ich Dich am Herzen gehegt habe, und so ist auch mir Deine Liebe wohlbewußt" (253).

But Larkens is not the only male character to form an especially affectionate bond with Nolten. Tillsen and Nolten's remarkable first encounter results in a practical *coup de foudre*: "Thus the two men lay firmly in one another's arms for a few seconds and, from this moment on, they were united in an active friendship that, in such a short time, is rarely possible between two men who, for all intents and purposes, were meeting each other for the first time in their lives."[106] Similarly, President von K. is momentarily silently transfixed on first setting his eyes on Nolten's face (363). And Nolten's open display of passionate feeling in greeting Baron von Neuburg is equally astounding: "[Nolten] rushes toward [the Baron] with outstretched arms and lies sobbing like a child around the neck of the venerable man whose head of white curls he covers in kisses."[107] Such exuberance is especially striking when compared with the unenthusiastic manner in which Nolten reacts to his betrothed Agnes only a few lines earlier: "when [Nolten] took a look at the sweet girl, she seemed no longer to belong to him at all, never to have had anything to do with him."[108]

These instances involving the aspirant artist Theobald Nolten certainly indicate that, in Mörike's novel, love and affection between men perform a significant part in the formation of the confined and coveted ranks of the world of art and cultural production.

---

[106] "So lagen sich beide Männer einige Sekunden lang fest in den Armen und von diesem Augenblicke an war eine lebhafte Freundschaft geschlossen, wie sie wohl in so kurzer Zeit zwischen zwei Menschen, die sich eigentlich zum ersten Male im Leben begegnen, selten möglich sein wird" (22).

[107] "Mit ausgestreckten Armen eilt er auf ihn zu und liegt schluchzend, als ein Kind, am Halse des ehrwürdigen Mannes, dessen weißgelockten Scheitel er mit Küssen deckt" (296).

[108] "wenn sein Blick auf das liebe Mädchen fiel, so schien sie ihm gar nicht mehr anzugehören, ihn niemals etwas angegangen zu haben" (296).

Indeed, from the example offered by Mörike's fictional rendition of the culture business, which accounts for an individual's aesthetic development within the context of social affairs, it is possible to surmise that the cultural – and perhaps, even, sociopolitical – power bases of men in Germany at the beginning of the nineteenth century were founded on a homosocial continuum that extended between men-acting-in-the-interests-of-men and men-loving men. To a significant degree, Mörike's *artists'* novel – with its intersecting circles of business and pleasure linking Wispel to Lörmer to Larkens to President von K. to Nolten to Nolten's Father to Agnes's Father to Neuburg to Leopold and Ferdinand to the Privy Councillor or Nolten's Uncle Friedrich to Raymund to Tillsen to Jaßfeld to Zarlin to Duke Adolf – demonstrates the type of "intelligible continuum of aims, emotions, and valuations" that Sedgwick reserves for the characterization of the various bonds between women in the twentieth century (2-3). In Mörike's text, men who love men, who raise, instruct, or guide men, who escort or give shelter to men, who invest in or sponsor men, who paint men, or who serve men, are all in the pursuit of comparable, if not identical, goals. Indeed, as I have already shown with the affect of Winckelmann's homoerotic criticism of ideal art on Lavater's physiognomy of an ideal artist, Theobald Nolten, the man's man, many of the men who choose him, and the physiognomical system upon which they rely to distinguish relations for the sake of art are all primarily informed by queer aesthetics. In *Maler Nolten*, male-male sexuality enables power relations.

It is from within such a web of men acting in their own interests – whether those interests concern art business or erotic desire – that Nolten begins to take steps in the direction of becoming recognized as an artist and, likewise, that every step Nolten takes is guided and known. The various relations of and about Nolten spur his ambitions and supervise his behavior. As he develops, Nolten's task is to learn how to know which of these associations and connections will afford him success in his chosen career, and which will only eventually serve as obstacles, put his aims at risk, or even bring about his demise. The other male characters are occupied with the endeavor of profiting from the opportunity presented by Nolten's appearance either to maintain their own authority or to attain their own goals through the young man's advancement. Readers aware of the exclusivity of men of letters – for the deliberations over Wispel's appearance in the opening scenes of the novel immediately draw attention to the closed nature of such circles – are invited by Mörike's text to witness how some men, and which men, succeed or not in the cultured world of men's men. Indeed, the interest in men, while used to promote men's interests, undergoes a degree of containment from within the male art community.

As I have mentioned above, the centrality of notions of masculinity particularly to art endeavors in the modern age begins with the methodically and stylistically groundbreaking aesthetic treatises on ancient Greek painting and sculpture by Winckelmann. I have also pointed out that Winckelmann's homoerotic fantasy underlies his work and its success. However, the homoerotic aspect of Winckelmann's life and works, while ever present, has not always been readily acknowledged (Kuzniar 10; Parker; Richter, "Winckelmann's Progeny" 38). The presence of intent homoeroticism in Winckelmann's style and subject-matter is circumstantially confirmed by his parallel appreciation for real-life male figures. Many of the homosexual interests of this connoisseur of beauty and taste are located within the homosocial frames of tutorship, the intelligentsia, and the clergy.[109] Yet, the case can be made that much of the art historian's cultural and academic success has hinged upon the simultaneous promotion of affectionate ties and of the appeal of the male form in his work with the nonavowal of, or at least confinement of, same-sex desire in the reception of his life and works (H. Mayer). Often the homoaffective aspect of Winckelmann's writings are referred to not as "homosexual" but deferred as pagan – for instance, by Goethe (Sweet) –

---

[109] Winckelmann's correspondence reveals affectionate relationships with numerous men that include his charge Peter Friedrich Wilhelm Lamprecht, Count von Bünau, several Roman boys, Prince Anhalt-Dessau, and the Livonian baron Friedrich Reinhold von Berg (see esp. Sweet; also E. M. Butler; Parker; Richter, "Winckelmann's Progeny"). On June 9, 1762, Winckelmann writes from Rome to the young baron and one time object of his desire "but here your image will be my saint;" "hier aber wird Ihr Bild mein Heiliger sein" (Rehm, *Winckelmann.Briefe* 2: 233; see also H. Mayer, ch. 11 "Winckelmann's Death and the Discovery of a Double Life" 167-74). Winckelmann uses here a common designation of the day to refer to a sodomitical lover – "*Heiliger*." Rüdiger remarks that the art-librarian kept his patron Cardinal Albani amused with the tales of his "*Amours*" (30). Also, Goethe concludes the section on "Beauty" in his biographical essay *Winckelmann und sein Jahrhundert* (*Winckelmann and His Century*, 1805) with the observation, "Thus we find Winckelmann often in relation with beautiful young men, and at no time does he appear more animated and more loveable than in such, often only fleeting moments;" "So finden wir Winckelmann oft in Verhältnis mit schönen Jünglingen, und niemals erscheint er belebter und liebenswürdiger als in solchen, oft nur flüchtigen Augenblicken." (423).

or deactivated as indicating a propensity for "kindred spirits" (E. M. Butler) or "ideal friendship" (Parker).[110] But the degree to which an individual's sexuality can ever be known or acknowledged specifically as a constituent of their work is very much an important factor when analyzing the relation between the aesthetic or intellectual impact of their work and the subsequent social organization of the people involved in the fields to which that work may pertain. Certainly, both homoaffectivity and a homoerotic sexuality shape the contours of the materials that form the foundations of Winckelmann's aesthetic assertions and are thus communicated to the art community along with those assertions.

The reception of Winckelmann and his work – often fraught with intellectualizing excuses – offers a significant lesson for understanding the physiognomical dynamic in operation in the very male-male organization of the men of art in Mörike's novel. Winckelmann's homoerotic art treatises do more than establish the male-male aesthetic ideal that predicates Lavater's portrayal of the ideal artist whose popular reception is evidently reflected in *Maler Nolten*. The reception of Winckelmann's queer scholarship also betrays a regulatory pattern of social behavior from the cultural community's very own cultural history. As Alice A. Kuzniar remarks, "homosexuality forms a division around which eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century culture organizes itself" ("Introduction" 3). The depiction of the network of intellectuals in *Maler Nolten* replicates this pattern of behavior. As seen, many of the bonds and connections formed between men in the world of art are based on an often mutual and affectionate desire. The representative potential artist Nolten is chosen in the first place because he is desirable to the authoritative looker Tillsen. Nolten may even have commandeered the services of Wispel to sketch him or Larkens to narrate him in a manner that would make him desirable to other men such as Tillsen and Leopold, etc. But, as evidenced by the physiognomies of Larkens and Wispel, other men's exclusion is justified by their being deemed queer. Indeed, for Nolten or others to be successful, the queer desire necessarily and constitutively embodied in homoaffective associations must either be kept under wraps or held within the bounds of ideal spirit as opposed to sex.

---

[110] Parker revives this trend by shedding doubt on the extent to which Winckelmann, a man of his time, could possibly have conceived of leading a gay lifestyle. He proposes that Winckelmann organized his interpersonal relationships with men according to the example set by the ancient Greeks he so admired (539). Though there is much validity in this, from Parker one is presumably to understand that while Winckelmann was intensely homoerotic in word and mind, it is unlikely he would have acted on this. Surely, Winckelmann's intellectualizing of his desires does not entirely preclude their physical consummation.

To gain access to artistic and intellectual privilege among men the artist must display a desirability *to* men that always remains devoid of homosexual undertones. As Sedgwick maintains, "the fact that what goes on [in male-homosocial domains] can look, with only a slight shift of optic, quite startlingly 'homosexual,' is not most importantly an expression of the psychic origin of these institutions in a repressed or sublimated homosexual genitality. Instead, it is the coming to visibility of the normally implicit terms of a coercive double bind ... For a man to be a man's man is separated only by an invisible, carefully blurred, always-already-crossed line from being 'interested in men'" (89). Thus in Mörike's text, just as in those works Sedgwick has studied, in order to consolidate influence, success, and power into the hands of a few, the all-male professional and emotional ties of the homosocial order – in this case, of art circles – are ultimately obliged to show themselves as discontinuous or distinguished from male-male sexual relations.

The world of *Maler Nolten* functions like the works in Sedgwick. The exception is that the nineteenth-century German author does reveal certain essential homoerotic goings-on in his world of men that occasion regulation (cf. Sedgwick 86). Yet, it too is managed by "the category 'homosexual' [whose importance comes] from its potential for giving whoever wields it a structuring definitional leverage over the whole range of male bonds that shape the social constitution" (86).

According to Sedgwick, homophobia operates most effectively over all men by complementing the random, violent terrorizing of a few distinct homosexuals with the difficulty for any man to know for sure that his behavior and associations are not homosexual (88-89). Sedgwick thus maintains that "paranoia is the psychosis that makes graphic the mechanisms of homophobia" (91). This same fear of being exposed as a homosexual surfaces in *Maler Nolten* to control the at once homoerotic and homosocial organization of artists. Just as was the case with the direct tyrannizing of Wispel,[111] so allusions to faces are often caught up in and reveal the operation of the subtler regulatory paranoia. "The unusually pale and disturbed appearance of the beautiful [Constanze]"[112] acts as the first hint that there is something 'unpleasant' below the surface of her realizations after reading the letters discovered after the shadow play in a bag next to Larkens's magic lantern box. Not only has she found out that Nolten has another love-interest in Agnes (164), but she has worked out that Larkens has stage-managed the entire seduction (166). Surely, Larkens's plan to disrupt the growing affection between Nolten and Constanze by planting revealing love letters (169) has been more revelatory than he intended. For as suggested by an expression less of anger or disappointment than of revulsion, Constanze must now imagine there to be more to Larkens's association with Nolten. She must realize that by preventing a relationship with her and assuring one with the clueless Agnes Larkens maintains his access to his friend as well as the outlet for his own affections. Constanze realizes that she is the victim of a romantic ruse of which homoerotic ties are possibly at the heart. This would explain why Constanze unmercifully does nothing to stop both Nolten and Larkens from facing legal action regarding the supposedly politically inflammatory content of their play (171, 176-77, 181; cf. Vogelmann 459) and why the magic lantern box has to be confiscated (178). Certainly fear begins to creep over Larkens when, after being found to have acted (in regard to the play) not with any ill intent, but curiously out of "a punishable impropriety," Larkens suspects "that something must be behind [the release]."[113] Indeed, it is Nolten's rival for Constanze's affections Duke Adolph who 'puts in the good word' for their release, though Larkens still doubts whether Constanze can be ruled out (237-38). Yet a point is also made of the fact that after his release Larkens immediately abandons his usual avoidance of any overt display of affection in order to kiss Nolten profusely. With his scheme unraveled, Larkens realizes he is a marked man and leaves the country to put on "a new phiz"[114] behind

---

[111] A graphic example of patriarchy's use of random acts of direct violence to control others is provided in Nolten's Father's reign of terror over his family with a pea-shooter (210). The suggestion of incest in the way the father shoots at his children is somewhat apparent as is perhaps the allusion to homosexuality in the

---

mentioning of Frederick the Great as a prime target for the father's stinging emissions.

[112] "Das ungewöhnlich blasse und verstörte Aussehen der schönen Frau" (170).

[113] "eine strafbare Unziemlichkeit"; "daß dahinter irgend etwas stecken müsse" (234).

[114] "eine neue Fratze" (253). Elsewhere the word "Fratze" is used in reference to Wispel (108).

which he can conceal himself. Quite simply, the nature of Larkens's relation to Nolten is unclear and he must distance himself to avoid courting any further suggestion of 'impropriety,' thereby jeopardizing the success he has planned for his friend (who now dedicates himself to art, 240) and his own stake in it. He abandons his attempt to insinuate himself into privileged art circles via Nolten, goes into exile, and assumes another identity.

Unfortunately for him, the threat of exposure follows him in the pursuant, networking figure of Nolten (cf. Labaye 180) and the loose talk of Wispel. While informing Nolten that he knows the whereabouts of his former acquaintance, Wispel does not mention Larkens's name, but leaves no doubt as to the identity of the person in question or to the too-close nature of their relationship by comparing the two to Castor and Pollux (353). The fact that a sustained fear of being exposed as a homosexual even ultimately leads to Larkens's death by suicide is confirmed by the realization of culpability in that exposure that is later written in "the expression of genuine pain and loathing on [Wispel's] contorted face."[115] Wispel is later arrested for his "shameful behavior" of extorting Larkens for "keeping quiet about his true character."[116] Nolten's impassioned outpouring over his friend's dead body rings like the confession of forbidden or impossible love (358; see also Schüpfer 119) and classifies their relationship as queer, thus offering further posthumous indication that Larkens's fear was justified. Larkens's death is both sad and ironically strategic, for in succumbing to the persecution of his paranoia he both brings about Nolten's further deliverance into influential intellectual circles – namely an introduction to the President von K. (cf. Horstmann 264) – and the albeit posthumous recognition of his own contribution to cultural production (cf. Storz 173). It is in this sense that Larkens can be considered a martyr (cf. Labaye 180).

The difficulty with which the nature of Larkens's body or affiliations may be kept free of aspersions of a queer kind is emphasized by two more brief episodes after his death. First, President von K. physiognomically recognizes in the dead Larkens the social-sexual cause of his downfall (and thus also the potential in Nolten) when remarking that "[In order] to make the riddle of such a misfortune complete, however, the body must also play its helping role, in order, in the absence of any real illness, [to create] an all the more heinous appearance with which to cause constant worry for the poor soul and to cause it to be completely in doubt about itself.'"[117] Then, Lörmer, who, as already mentioned, protests his current living arrangement with Wispel and so not only condemns the fishy fellow but also goes out of his way to quell any suspicion of any reciprocity on his part to Wispel's licentious advances (347), now echoes Nolten's violent passion for Larkens in a late-night drunken outburst for the recently deceased man who apparently used to call him "his dear beast"[118] (365-66). Certainly such events can only make Larkens's avowed secret passion for Agnes appear as much a fabrication for the sake of the cause as his arrangement of Nolten's attachment to her (cf. 360; cf. Sammons, esp. 214, 217, 219). Yet, clearly the need to avoid such obfuscation in the nature of one's sexuality pervades the relations of the art community. It is evident that President von K.'s loveless marriage is a sham (377). Baron von Neuburg reverts to body language to impress upon Nolten the need to marry Agnes, no matter her condition, thus also securing their own bond and continuing where Larkens had earlier left off: "our friend thought he understood the Baron perfectly as the latter, with a very particular satisfaction and a type of solemnity, placed his hand on Agnes's pretty head while glancing over at her fiancé. Nolten found consolation in the fact that he could share with a man whom he so very much admired the gentle reproof of having so terribly underappreciated the dear creature. You see, it was this idea – although perhaps still a little obscure – but it had been this very same idea that had taken a great weight off his mind just at the moment when the Baron made his entrance into the room."[119] Such patterns – like the battle for a woman (see

---

[115] "der Ausdruck von unverstelltem Schmerz und Abscheu auf dem verzerrten Gesicht dieses Menschen" (356).

[116] "Schändlichkeiten"; "das Stillschweigen über seinen wahren Charakter" (367).

---

[117] "'Das Rätsel eines solchen Unglücks aber völlig zu machen, muß noch der Körper helfen, um, wenn die wahre Krankheit fehlt, mit einem nur um desto gräßlicheren Schein die arme Seele abzuängstigen und vollends irre an sich selber zu machen!'" (363-64).

[118] "sein liebes Vieh" (365).

[119] "unser Freund glaubte den Baron vollkommen zu verstehen, als dieser mit ganz eignem Wohlgefallen und einer Art von Feierlichkeit seine Hand auf das schöne Haupt Agnesens legte, indem er einem Blick auf den Bräutigam hinüberlaufen ließ. Nolten fand einen Trost darin, daß er den heimlichen Vorwurf, das teure Geschöpf so tief verkannt zu haben, mit einem Manne teilen durfte, den er so sehr verehrte; ja es war diese Idee, wiewohl vielleicht nur dunkel, eben dasjenige gewesen, was ihm gleich bei des Barons Eintritt ins

Bohnengel 56f.) – are likely a reaction to the culture of the "public intimacy between men" that was intrinsic to cultural life at Winckelmann's time and in the period of German classicism (see Richter, "Winckelmann's Progeny" 45-46). What was once acceptable and unproblematic in regard to understanding masculinity in what Simon Richter terms "the Age of Homosocial Friendship and Cultural Production" (35), has become moot and the object of tacit and strict social regulation certainly by the time Mörike starts to write his novel at the beginning of the 1830s.[120] While the very foundations of art in the German *Kunstperiode* were constructed on a queer aesthetic of male-male spectatorship and desire, *Maler Nolten* shows that by the end of the romantic period this phenomenon could not be directly acknowledged or acted upon without its perpetrators facing recrimination. Mörike's text is thus archetypal of a modern literature for a modern society since it bears the superintendent marks of shame and self-reproach (see Steakley, "Sodomy" 174; H. Mayer 173-74). It is also typical of the overall literary portrayal of a male-male erotic since it provides an occasion to show social rules and retribution (Popp 6).

Mörike's text shows the simultaneity of the libidinal impetus and sexual divide delimiting the members of the world of art and culture, and depicts the dangers in the coming to light of the slight chance that relations pertaining to symbolic power could at the same time involve sexual relations. The novel indicates that a homosexual erotic underlies the system of male intellectual circles and discloses the homophobic mechanisms of modern patriarchy that, so as to keep the reins of power and authority in the hands of a few, assure against the public avowal of this same-sex eros. But Mörike's text reveals that the suppression of homosexuality not only seems necessary for the maintenance of male domination, it is also devastating for the individual queer men whose tremendously ambitious enthusiasm for art and culture is so intrinsic to its initiation. *Maler Nolten* suggests that such a state of affairs, where the queer component of culture is repressed, is counterproductive and detrimental to life and art (compare Schüpfer 36-37; cf. Storz 175).

Zimmer die größte Last vom Herzen weggenommen" (297).

[120] Richter even locates this shift around 1806 ("Winckelmann's Progeny" 41 & 45). He relies on Derks's *Die Schande der heiligen Päderastie*, esp. 313-68.

After all, the chosen artist Theobald Nolten is recognized and promoted because his looks are seen to meet the requirements of the masculine aesthetic ideal and not because he produces any art. Nor do his attempts at physiognomy indicate his predestination for an artistic career. For Nolten cannot accurately read the faces of the Privy Councillor (30), Constanze (90, 93), and Margot (409; cf. 392), he fails to recognize Wispel (93, 95) and Henriette (265), and disagrees with Baron von Neuburg's assertion of the poetic or artistic physiognomy of the good-looking boy, though he does see the character of Lichtenberg in Napoleon (302). In fact, in spite of the art community's male critics' appreciation of him, he is read by others in ways that physiognomically rule him out of being an artist. Tillsen's Wife notices the turbulence on his face (21) and the Privy Councillor recognizes "an unusual glow" in his eyes, whereas Governess Frau von Niethelm appears "not in the least unmoved" by Nolten's conversation yet says little after trying to read his face, and the final assessment of the protagonist pauses on "the oddly restrained, the feebly resigned in his mien."[121] The Privy Councillor maintains from the outset that Nolten is a fake (28, 29; see also Jennings, "Grotesquery" 600-01).

If the fake or unlikely is promoted as the genuine artist in *Maler Nolten*, then is it not possible that the truly genuine artist is that person who is made out to be fake or unlikely? Besides the established Friedrich Nolten (the Privy Councillor) (cf. 27, 30, 233, 266), only Larkens and Wispel can be considered as having produced any original art (Immerwahr, "*Maler Nolten*" 65; cf. Immerwahr, "Loves" 74; Jennings, "Grotesquery" 612; Liebrand 107-08). For Larkens is the author of the letters to Agnes, poems, a play, and the tale of Nolten's youth (see also Eilert 169; M. Mayer 87-88), and certainly it is worth asking again whether Wispel is after all the originator of the sketches that Tillsen copied and that Nolten later claims were taken from him (16). Annette Scholl remarks that Wispel satirically represents "features of a fundamental questioning of the contemporary art world and its products," that he lampoons the art world, its market, and bourgeois art consumers (80-81; see also Hausdörfer 264; Heydebrand 280; Schüpfer 114; cf. Storz 201). Certainly *Maler Nolten* shows how members of a male, class elite take recourse to Nolten as the standard-bearer of their own established position (cf. Labaye 175) and also how especially Nolten's entourage of marginals and outsiders, keen to have their work recognized by established art circles, yet not *looking* the part (due to class, race, gender, and sexuality), endeavor to make something of a nobody who, in spite of his lack of skill, happens to fit the bill more than they as far as all-important appearance is concerned. Furthermore, Wispel's several drag interventions as various cultural types only further expose the performativity of the figure of the artist. His imitation reveals the constructedness of, and thus absence of, an original inherent creative genius.[122]

---

[121] "eine ungewöhnliche Glut" (266); "keineswegs ungerührt" (271); "das sonderbar Gehaltene, matt Resignierte in seiner Miene" (444).

Mörike, who may have had homosexual tendencies in his youth (see Holthausen 27; see also Popp 55), offers elsewhere in his oeuvre a literary treatment of the problem that homosexual desire poses for the citizens of the cultural class (*Bildungsbürgertum*). Complete with its fantasy of the physiognomically loaded figure of a young lad ("Knabengestalt") with locks to be brushed from his forehead, Mörike's poem dedicated to Hermann Hardegg "An Hermann" ("To Hermann," 1837, revised 1866 [Simon 97, 300]) reflects on the dilemma faced by two friends from youth who cannot realize their sensual love as grown men since neither can find the words to break the spell of the rules of society that constrain male-male friendship (Popp 54). Just as the description of Nolten, the brief physical outline of the object of the desire of this male poetic eye sufficiently coincides with both the male aesthetic ideal and the male standard of intellectual worth. Indeed, the physiognomical location of sexual desire becomes the site of sexual tension. Physiognomy is a principal means by which male cultural authorities are able to assert those whose social-sexual natures will incline them to develop into conforming adult citizens. It is also a tool used to terrorize, brand, and exclude those who may threaten the privilege of select males.

---

[122] The similarity between Wispel's queer relation to genius and Judith Butler's work on drag and gender is undeniably striking and requires exploration as a separate project.

Chapter Three

Physiognomical Sensation and Cultural Coming of Age in Stifter's *Der Nachsommer*

This chapter examines the role of physiognomy as it relates to the development of the protagonist of Adalbert Stifter's *Der Nachsommer. Eine Erzählung* (*Indian Summer*, 1857). Stifter's highly orchestrated three-volume "tale" published in 1857 is often cited by critics as one example from the Bildungsroman tradition in which *Bildung* – or the harmonious pedagogical formation and social integration of a young man – is successfully achieved.[1] The principal character Heinrich Drendorf 'gets the girl' – the woman of his desires Natalie Tarona. Or more precisely, he wins the approval of his parents, of his future mother-in-law, and of his guardian, and is well on the way to amassing a small fortune in property and art acquired in part through marriage and in part through family inheritance. Along the way he also gradually accrues a wealth of knowledge on a wide range of topics. By a combination of observation, self-study, mentoring, polite conversation, and example, Heinrich becomes versed in disciplines from across the liberal arts – from natural history to architecture and from art history to literature. One of the less strictly academic, yet key components of Heinrich's scientific and artistic education is physiognomy. Indeed, Stifter's text includes episodes involving physiognomy in a way that suggests that successful *Bildung* hinges on the sharpening of physiognomical sensation, or the supposedly inherent skill of reading human faces.[2] The narrative implies that excellence in one's ability to recognize in a beautiful face the full dimensions of another's soul – their wisdom, morality, and artistic sensitivity – is the best and most incontrovertible proof of the high caliber of one's own intellect and regard for culture. As such, Stifter's novel stands as a testimony to the continued cultural use of physiognomy in German-speaking lands since the publication of Johann Caspar Lavater's *Physiognomical Fragments* from 1775 to 1778.

---

[1] See Whitinger ("Elements" 249n2-3); and Grimm (25n2). To these lists one may add Aluf; Frye; Lange; K.-D. Müller; Salm; and Schmitt.

[2] See also Tytler (290-97). Cf. Rossbacher who maintains that in Stifter's works the human body is used to express the soul, but that there are no physiognomical interpretations except for in the story "Bergmilch" (50). My discussion shows Rossbacher to be inaccurate on this point.

However, another group of critics points out that Stifter's variation on the theme of *Bildung* contains subtle elements that dilute the completeness and validity of the protagonist's success with a measure of irony.[3] This group emphasizes the fact that the goal of *Der Nachsommer* is achieved in an idealized time before the dawn of modernity and the disturbing effects of the Industrial Revolution, and even at a far remove from everyday business and politics, on secluded estates, and that the 31-year-old narrator and hero ends his story just at the moment he is about to enter mature life and embark on some career or other. Just as the proclaimed *Bildung* is ironically subverted by certain subtle stylistic features and cultural references – such that that *Bildung* is eventually seen to be too forced or too detached from the real world – so does the novel's appropriation of the practice of physiognomy contain elements that must question the knowledge, efficacy, and benevolent intentions of the phenomenon. Indeed, the very component of Heinrich's education that seems so intent on sustaining the ideal of *Bildung* ultimately proves to be the prompt of another ironic twist that qualifies its validity and attainability. On the one hand, Stifter portrays Heinrich's personal and cultural advancement as being contingent not only on his effort to hone his creative and art-critical skills, but also on his becoming proficient in the fine art of physiognomy. For the most part physiognomy is shown to be a failsafe, even inspired method of corroborating the authenticity of an individual's intellectual or artistic disposition. It assists, therefore, the endeavor to allocate positions of cultural authority to certain people, including – by repercussion – the physiognomist him- or herself. On the other hand, the narration reveals how Heinrich's physiognomical capability is more the result of gentle coaxing and study, and less an inborn talent. At best, his skill is willed or learned. At worst, it is inaccurate, uncertain, and lacking. Yet Heinrich still seems to succeed. This contradiction shows physiognomy to be deceptive. It is part of an agenda that is concerned less with revealing natural truths than with inventing them. Indeed, recalling the theoretical assertion of French philosopher-historian Michel Foucault that observations of the human body become the foundation of an expression of power (see esp. *Discipline and Punish*), physiognomy in Stifter's novel proves to be an elaborate system of knowledge invoked expressly to promote and maintain the symbolic power and authority of a select few – regardless of their genuine ability – while keeping the social access or standing of others in check.

---

[3] See Whitinger ("Elements" 349-50n4-5). To this list one may add Blasberg; Gillespie; Grimm; Tielke; and Tismar.

The correlation in the novel between the assertion of *Bildung* and the knowledge of the face indicates not only that Stifter was attuned to the modern consideration of the face as a means of demonstrating a person's aptitude and providence, but also that he was aware that a command of physiognomy or an attention to appearances was a factor both in the instruction and in the cultural accession of a young man in central Europe in the middle of the nineteenth century. An examination of *Der Nachsommer* that focuses on the descriptions of faces and the legacy of physiognomy appropriated in the novel will provide further insight into the ongoing perceived utility of this cultural phenomenon as well as shed light on the means and ends of Heinrich's journey to his cultural coming of age. It will point to several stages along this journey that vividly evoke the work of the physiognomist Lavater. But by eventually concentrating particularly on the question of Heinrich's proficiency as a physiognomist, the current examination will also give further support to the point of view that Stifter's work contains a number of devices and discourses – with physiognomy as one of them – that subtly qualify the depiction of a harmonious reality and the extent to which or the manner in which artistic excellence and recognized intellectual expertise can be attained.

A reader attentive to allusions to or descriptions of faces in *Der Nachsommer* will discover nearly 180 such instances. Of these, by far the largest amount come from Heinrich's perspective in his dual role of character and first-person narrator,[4] thus indicating that throughout his development Heinrich becomes particularly attuned to observing, describing, and assessing others' faces. Heinrich shares this tendency with his rural host and mentor Baron Gustav von Risach who proves to be the next most prolific observer of faces.[5] The fact that the majority of Risach's observations are contained within his retrospective narration of his own life-story, which, along with Risach's other didactic discussions, chronologically precedes Heinrich's act of narration, suggests that Risach encouraged Heinrich to practice physiognomy. Many other members of the novel's cast also either offer brief commentaries or are seen to pay attention to others' faces.[6] Though by no means insignificant, the number of observations made by the rest of the cast is negligible once compared to the large quantity made by Heinrich and by Risach.

---

[4] 31-32, 41, 47, 49, 53, 62, 65, 68, 82, 85, 94, 107, 113-14, 137, 143, 151, 159, 160-62, 163, 168, 171, 172, 182, 184, 192, 192-93, 194, 196, 201, 209-10, 212, 216, 219, 222, 231, 234, 237, 244, 247, 254, 256, 288, 290, 291-92, 300, 301, 338, 352, 361, 372, 374, 374-75, 375-76, 392, 394-95, 398, 399-400, 401, 412, 418, 421, 434, 444, 448, 449, 452, 454, 457, 461, 465-66, 468, 473, 476, 479, 481, 483, 490, 492, 509, 511, 520, 521, 522, 530, 549, 557, 633, 647, 651, 656, 660, 661, 662, 663, 667, 668, 674.

With over 40 observations referring to her alone, Natalie is the most frequently regarded character.[7] Nonetheless, her physical description remains rudimentary. Her eyes are "large," "beautiful," "black," "pure," and "indescribably noble" (159, 193, 196, 201, 234, 244, 247, 449, 452, 461, 468, 630), her hair is "beautiful" and "brown" (193, 196, 203, 209, 454, 465, 630), her lips are "beautiful" or "sweet" (449, 454), her mouth is "gracious and unspeakably kind"(193), her face flushes red (244, 398, 663) and is "smooth and fine" (193), "friendly" (201), "indescribably beautiful" (465), "beautiful and youthful" (489), and "delightful" (509), her features are "sweet and charming" (247) and "more noble, more likeable, and more loveable" than anyone else's (490), her figure is "fine" (203) or "noble and slim" (219), and her poise is "gracious" (203). Finally, she can appear both "lively as a rose" and "pale as a white lily" (452; 661). Natalie is a manifest beauty.

At least an additional 20 facial observations specifically concern each of three characters, Natalie's mother Mathilde Makloden, Natalie's brother Gustav, and Risach,[8] while the remainder are fairly evenly distributed between another 25 characters.[9] Again, the descriptions of Mathilde, Gustav, and Risach remain basic. As a girl, Mathilde's cheeks are "fresh, a gentle red" and "slightly elongated" or "purple" (597-98, 608), her mouth is "rose-red" (598, 604), her lips are "soft" (603), her eyes are "big," "beautiful," "sparkling," and "black" (598, 604, 608, 609), her hair is "pure brown" (598), her brow is "gentle" (598), and her figure is "slim" (603). She is also likened to a rose (601, 620) and to a lily (606), as well as to an angel (607, 609). As a mature woman, however, Mathilde's "large" "black" eyes (193, 194, 195, 196), the "two very fine streaks of silver" in her hair (193, 196), her "very sweet and pretty" mouth (193), her "gentle" smile (457), and her "pure" brow (395) combine to form a "beautiful," "happy," "friendly," "delightful," "gracious," and "fine" (212, 374-75, 394, 395, 461), yet "wrinkled" face that is likened now to a fading rose (192, 212, 374). Gustav's hair is a "thick" and "lustrous" "brown" "mop" that falls "about his brow" (53, 113, 172, 203, 300, 629), he has "large black," "lively" or "sparkling" eyes (62, 172, 201, 222, 244, 300, 629, 660), a "rosy" or "tanned" complexion (62, 172, 244, 300; cf. 662), a "slim build" (114), "round" and "soft" features (400) that together compose a "powerful" and "simple" face (376) that is also "happy" (114, 172, 244) or "sad" (172), "friendly" (142), and "healthy" (376). In short, Gustav is beautiful (62, 376). Risach is "a man with snow-white" (41) or just "white hair" (49, 68, 113, 163, 168, 172, 628), whose face, while revealing his advanced years, gives a younger impression than his hair and is "friendly, with a good complexion, and without the flab of the onset of old age," making his age difficult to determine (41), he has a slight forward stoop (68), his still complete set of teeth are "beautiful," "very close together, white, small, and covered by a fine enamel" (172), and his cheeks are "a fine and healthy red" (172). Like those of Natalie, Mathilde, and Gustav, Risach's description contains just enough detail – and certainly no more – to categorize him as a very pleasant-looking person. Indeed, according to the widow at the imperial palace, Risach was exceptionally handsome when he was young (165).

---

[5] 50, 169, 195, 576, 581, 587, 596, 597, 597-98, 601, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 615, 616, 620, 626, 627, 628, 629, 632, 633, 647, 666.

[6] These include Heinrich's family (16), Gustav (142, 628), an anonymous theater critic (155), Natalie (159, 352, 452), the widow at the imperial palace (165), Mathilde (194, 195, 400, 628, 629, 630), Roland (261, 357, 413-15), an anonymous art critic (288), the Princess (489-90), the Asperhof servants (492), the Sternenhof servants (511), Klotilde (514), the gardener's wife Clara (553), Alfred (588), Mathilde's mother (615), Heinrich's father (641), and the old woman who was the Drendorfs' neighbor in the city (666).

[7] 143, 159, 193, 194, 196, 201, 203, 209-10, 219, 231, 234, 237, 244, 247, 338, 374-75, 398, 399, 400, 400, 401, 421, 444, 448, 449, 452, 454, 461, 465, 465-66, 468, 473, 489-90, 509, 630, 632, 641, 656, 663, 667, 668.

---

[8] Mathilde: 192-93, 194, 195, 196, 210, 212, 374-75, 394-95, 400, 457, 461, 597-98, 601, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 620, 628, 656; Gustav: 53, 62, 113-14, 137, 169, 172, 192, 196, 201, 203, 222, 234, 244, 300, 375-76, 399-400, 628, 629, 656, 660, 661, 662; and Risach: 41, 41, 47, 49, 68, 113-14, 163, 165, 166, 168, 172, 182, 192, 210, 476, 565, 615, 627, 628, 629, 656.

[9] They include Heinrich's mother (12, 372, 433), Heinrich (16, 195, 476, 479, 490, 633, 657, 666, 666), the vicar of Rohrberg (65), the artist Eustach (82, 85, 197), Simon the gardener (94, 107, 171), Heinrich's sister Klotilde (151, 256, 399, 481, 483, 521, 522, 530), the roving artist Roland (184, 216, 254, 549), Julie Ingheim (209-10, 418), Apollonia Ingheim (209-10, 418), Ingheim's wife (210), Ingheim (210), Heinrich's father (256, 344-45, 433, 520, 651), the widowed Princess (288, 290, 374-75, 490), Heinrich's companion Kaspar (392), Tillberg (413), Tillberg's son (413), Haßberg (413), Baron von Wachten's son (415), Sandung (415), Risach's sister (576), Risach's brother-in-law (581, 584), Mathilde's mother (587, 601, 615), Mathilde's brother Alfred (587, 596, 597, 601), Risach's wife Julie (626), and the zither player (674). There are also allusions to the faces of groups of people (women in general: 50, 192-93, 212; the Ingheims: 219; the Drendorfs: 345; country and mountain girls: 301; the Asperhof servants: 492; and the Sternenhof servants: 511) and to the figures of animals (a dead stag: 31, 32; hunting dogs: 32). The figures of paintings and sculpture are also often treated physiognomically, a point I shall return to later.

Stifter's *Nachsommer* does not give attention to faces simply for the sake of pictorial realism. Lauren Small remarks that "Heinrich is nothing more than a device for seeing things" (4), that "there does not seem to be anyone behind" (5), implying that his observation is empty of meaning. Yet the text draws explicit attention to the act of regarding faces and is keen to record the practice of taking stock of any apparent meaning to be gleaned from their features. There are several different reasons for looking at people. First of all, looking is shown to be an act of pleasure as, for example, when Heinrich confesses to enjoying watching Gustav (113) and to being drawn to him (300). Looking also conveys awe or respect as indicated both by Gustav's habit of literally looking up to Heinrich (142) and by the tendency of Mathilde's brother Alfred to look toward Risach's face (588, 628). In contrast, the roving artist Roland's habit of gazing at Natalie borders on lechery (216, 357, 676).

Most of all, characters are in the habit of using their looks and glances as a means of communicating. They look in order to express and gather important information concerning an individual's mood or physical condition at any particular moment. Heinrich knows not to sit too high up in the auditorium at the theater so that he can still see and observe the actors' faces and not just the tops of their heads (156). Heinrich and Natalie search each other's faces in order to assess the situation and each other's mood when they first make contact and empathize at the theater in Vienna (159, 452) and once when encountering each other by surprise (444). Similarly, Heinrich learns of the Asperhof and the Sternenhof servants' approval of his engagement to Natalie by reading the look on their faces (492, 511), and his sister Klotilde's face signals her concern over losing her brother after learning about his engagement whereupon she expresses her desire for reassurance by looking at him (483). Even the youthful Risach interprets the girl-Mathilde's body language in order to find confirmation of their passion (605, 609) and, later as adults, they scan each other's faces for the remnants of their affection and for forgiveness for its curtailment (628, 629). In addition, several of the characters' faces at some point or other blush out of embarrassment or modesty[10] or reveal their happiness[11] or despondency.[12] The face often reflects an improvement in an individual character's health as a consequence of their exposure to the sun and exercise in the open mountain air and scenery.[13] It also shows the signs of growing up[14] and growing old.[15] Finally, the striking family resemblances of the Maklodens / Taronas are indicated by their faces. Mathilde's mother, Mathilde, Gustav, and Natalie have the same large black eyes, the same facial features, and the same thick brown locks.[16] In fact, Natalie and Gustav are so alike that at times they even seem to merge into one (201, 203, 400), and it is said that Mathilde once looked just like Natalie (210, 374-75).[17]

Certainly, the attention given to faces is an indication of the author's awareness of the apparent legibility of faces and the popular illustrative role they play in human affairs.

---

[10] Eustach: 85; Gustav: 137; Natalie: 194, 237, 401, 444, 473; Heinrich: 476, 490; Mathilde as a girl: 605; Risach: 635.

[11] Heinrich: 195, 479; Heinrich's father: 344, 433, 651; Heinrich's mother: 345, 372, 433; Klotilde: 345, 481; Risach: 476; Mathilde, Risach, Natalie, and Gustav: 656; the zither player: 674.

[12] Risach: 615.

[13] Gustav: 113, 300, 376; Risach: 172; Kaspar: 392; Natalie: 401; Heinrich's father: 520; Klotilde: 522, 530.

[14] Klotilde: 150; Gustav: 172, 203, 660; Natalie: 338; Alfred: 597; Mathilde: 608.

[15] Risach: 41; Simon: 94, 171; Mathilde: 628; cf. Heinrich's father: 344.

[16] For explicit resemblances, see 196, 201, 203, 234, 244, 629, 630; for Mathilde's mother's large dark eyes and brown hair, see also 587; for Mathilde's large dark eyes and brown hair, see also 193, 194, 195, 196, 598, 604, 608; for Natalie's large dark eyes and brown hair, see also 159, 193, 209, 449, 461, 468; for Gustav's large dark eyes and brown hair, see also 53, 62, 113, 172, 222, 274, 300. Mathilde's brother Alfred has brown hair, but dark blue eyes (587).

[17] Tytler remarks that "family resemblances have a structural and poetic significance in so far as they link the main characters together and form an essential part of the theme of love" (240) and they serve "as a link between the past and the present" (242). See also Keller (227-28).

The abundant references made to faces in Stifter's novel more or less reiterate the kind of uses to which they were put by the Swiss physiognomist Lavater.[18] In his *Physiognomical Fragments*, Lavater adopts depictions and descriptions of faces as elements comprising knowledge in a discursive system designed not just to illustrate, but to expose, evaluate, and arrange the underlying – moral, psychological, and vocational – dimensions of each and every member of society into an established order. Sure enough, in addition to the above pathognomic concerns (i.e., in this context, examinations of physical expression as opposed to the judgment of the characteristics of specific diseases), *Der Nachsommer* is rich in instances where faces are observed with the specifically physiognomical intention of searching for the deeper meaning contained in facial features. For instance, both Risach and Mathilde look at Heinrich as if to size him up before speaking to him for the first time (41, 194, 195). Klotilde observes her brother as if to take stock of who he is becoming (514). The gardener's wife Clara steals sideward glances at Heinrich to assess whether he is a good match for Natalie (553), and the widowed Princess admits to having observed many people in her time (489). But the text most consistently draws explicit attention to the act of regarding other people's faces when Heinrich is the observer. Heinrich undertakes close physiognomical studies of Risach, of Roland, of the combined image of Natalie and Gustav's faces, of the successive faces of Natalie, Gustav, and Mathilde, of the Ingheim girls, of the Princess as compared with Mathilde, or of Natalie by herself, of his friends at the Asperhof in general, of girls' heads, of Klotilde's girlfriends and other girls, of youths, of specifically older women for the stories contained in their features, of older men and women together, and of the common people.[19] Sometimes, Heinrich's examination of faces is a covert or furtive act, such as when he observes Natalie by way of her reflection in a mirror (201) and when she appears to be lost in thought (237), or when they dare not look at each other directly lest in doing so, they catch one other (352). In contrast, in two separate incidents, Heinrich maintains that the head of a dead stag and Natalie's form literally speak to him (465). Nonetheless, Heinrich is not interested merely in the general beauty of particular faces, he is concerned with their revelation of people's souls: "Since I had observed so many faces so closely in order to draw them, I now realized that it was more than this beauty, that it was the soul that presented itself graciously and self-contained and that had an effect on the people who came near her."[20]

---

[18] Doppler includes Lavater in a list of classical authors of whom Biedermeier writers such as Stifter make particular use (211).

[19] "... sah ich mir den Mann [Risach] näher an" (41); "ihn [Roland] genauer zu beobachten" (216); "Ich sah in die schönen, jugendlichen Angesichter ... Ich sah auf sie, so lange ich sie erblicken konnte" (234); "Ich betrachtete Natalie ... Ich blickte auf Gustav ... Ich blickte auch Mathilden an" (399-400); "Ich betrachtete ... auch die Schönheit der Mädchen" (209); "... wurde ich nicht bloß auf die Fürstin noch mehr aufmerksam ... sondern ich betrachtete auch Mathilden wieder genauer" (375); "Ich sah lange auf die Gestalt" (400), "ich konnte Natalien jetzt erst ein wenig betrachten" (448), and "Ich beobachtete nur zwei Augenblicke ihre sinnende Stellung" (465); "[ich] sah die geliebten Angesichter der Menschen, die mich umgaben" (361); "ich suchte mir Kenntnisse über das menschliche Antlitz zu verschaffen. Ich ging in die kaiserliche Bildersammlung und betrachtete dort alle schönen Mädchenköpfe, welche ich abgemalt fand. Ich ging öfter hin, und betrachtete

Heinrich's desire to know the human soul or the nature of individuals by means of the face explicitly evokes the discourse of physiognomy and the work of its foremost proponent Lavater. Although he is never mentioned by name, and though it is not always immediately obvious, Lavater's presence – his materials and methods, his motives, and his modern modifications to physiognomy – can be felt throughout Stifter's novel. Even the name that Heinrich gives to his project of independent study – "My journal of illustrations for keeping order" ("Mein Tagebuch der Aufzeichnungen zur Festhaltung der Ordnung" 186) – summons the taxonomical itinerary of Lavater's voluminous *Fragments*. And a proposal as apparently innocuous as Roland's to draw a color map according to the pastimes and pleasures of the guests at the Sternenhof feast in order to arrange them into groups (416) suggests a propensity in the novel with categorizing people. Christoph Buggert remarks that Stifter's frequent use of words such as *Gattung* ("species," "genus," "kind," etc.) and *Art*

---

die Köpfe. Aber auch von lebenden Mädchen, mit denen ich zusammentraf, sah ich die Angesichter an, ja ich ging ... auf öffentliche Spaziergänge, und sah die Angesichter der Mädchen an, die ich traf" (161); "Die Freundinnen meiner Schwester oder andere Mädchen, mit denen ich gelegentlich zusammen kam, hatten manche liebe angenehme Eigenschaften in ihrem Angesichte, ich betrachtete sie" (162); "betrachtete ich auch gerne Köpfe von Jünglingen" (375); "war ich auch auf die Angesichter ältlicher und alter Frauen aufmerksam geworden ... Liegt nicht eine Geschichte darin ... die ihren Wiederschein auf die Züge gießt, daß wir sie mit Rührung lesen oder ahnen?" (374); "Ich fing nun an, Männer und Frauen, die in höherem Alter sind, zu betrachten und sie um die Bedeutung ihrer Züge zu erforschen" (375); "Ich besuchte ... gerne Orte, an welchen sich viele Menschen ... versammeln, um die Art ihrer Erscheinung, ihr Wesen und ihr Verhalten als eines Ganzen sehen zu können. Vorzüglich ging ich dahin, wo das eigentliche Volk ... zusammenkömmt" (291-92).

[20] "Und mehr als diese Schönheit war es, wie ich wohl jetzt erkannte, da ich so viele Angesichter so genau betrachtet hatte, um sie nachzubilden, die Seele, welche gütig und abgeschlossen sich darstellte und auf die Menschen, die ihr naheten, wirkte." (395).

("manner," "kind," "type," etc.) reveal a certain "inclination toward systematization" (192) and that in *Der Nachsommer* reality is presented "as an abstract-systematized inventory" (194).

Several elements and episodes of the narration betray a familiarity with Lavater's physiognomy by referring to the materials or methods that he favored for the sake of accuracy and affect. For example, Risach and Eustach's detailed studies of buildings and manufactured objects are arranged in a comprehensive set of folders (85, 86) and thus in much the same way as Lavater brings together in his four volumes plate upon plate of sketches and outlines indicating parts of, profiles of, or front views of human faces. Risach extols the use of copperplate engravings since they replace color with the clarity of lines and make it possible to provide copies of originals that can be distributed widely among a larger number of people (559). This echoes Lavater's preference for silhouettes for much the same reasons (see esp. *Physiognomische Fragmente* 152-64). Likewise evoking Lavater, Heinrich recalls having read somewhere that objects are better understood once they have been reproduced in a drawing (167-68) and he goes on to learn not to be distracted by minute details when painting landscapes and portraits, but to concentrate on a more generous or broader overview of principal lines, features, and tones (273, 274). Heinrich gradually realizes that the purpose of his drawings of heads lies in the reproduction of their distinctive lines and colors not for their own sake, but for the sake of revealing the soul (376). Finally, Stifter's text evokes Lavater's directive to record the physiognomical effect of the face particularly in the settled or fixed state of sleeping subjects, of impressions of the dead, and of plaster busts (Lavater, "First Letter," *Essays* 149-50) on the occasions when Heinrich observes Natalie at rest (465), when he deliberates on the head of a dead stag (31-32), and when he studies paintings, statues, and cameos (esp. 161, 162, 301-03, 323, 367, 367-68, 375, 376, 556, 557).

Der Nachsommer does not limit itself to restating Lavater's preferred conditions for physiognomical research. It also shares the same underlying program of intent as Lavater's work. For a start, Risach's motivation for collecting and preserving beautiful art objects – "for the love of mankind" ("aus Liebe zur Menschheit" 499) – draws on the same humanist ideal that supposedly inspired Lavater's physiognomical study and that is contained in its subtitle: "*zur Beförderung der Menschenkenntnis und Menschenliebe*" ("*For the Promotion of the Knowledge and Love of Mankind*"). But for all the purported good intentions of his antiquarianism and philanthropy, both Risach's estimation of poets as "the priests of beauty" ("die Priester des Schönen" 275) and his assertion that those with an appreciation for art possess a go-between function as disseminators and – again – "priests of the creative gods" ("Priester dieser [erschaffenden] Götter" 572) betray an inclination toward a social hierarchy or cultural elitism.[21] These two remarks allude to the favoritism found in Lavater's *Fragments*[22] where the Swiss physiognomist squarely allots each member of society a position in the overall table of humanity and yet reserves a special facilitating place for particular cultural producers: "The poet is the prophet of divine creation and providence; the mediator between nature and the sons and daughters of nature."[23] Like Lavater, several members of the cast of Stifter's novel engage in reviewing and/or issuing standards for the sake of establishing a clear, controlled, and conclusive order among things. Risach's imposition of order on house and garden expresses an obsessive tendency to compartmentalize or tyrannize.[24] Thus again like Lavater – but also bearing in mind this largely rural novel's behind-the-scenes worlds of state politics, of business, and of general modern-day urban life – Stifter surely recognizes in the compelling practice of physiognomy the means by which particularly artistic intellectuals may gather sufficient evidence to locate a permanent position of privilege for themselves in the order of a society already beginning to emit signs of change.

The most remarkable way in which Stifter's *Nachsommer* reflects Lavater's work lies in the novel's replication both of the structure of thought supporting Lavaterian physiognomy and also of the significant epistemic shift emerging in it. Heinrich's comprehensive studies of nature – as well as his interest in the edifices of buildings and technical design – reflect the taxonomical episteme perceived by Foucault as common particularly to natural history as well as to other fields of scholarly inquiry in the eighteenth century,[25] and which I have traced in Lavater's physiognomic treatises in my opening chapters. In *The Order of Things*, Foucault deliberates on how in the classical period the earlier epistemic model of the Renaissance period of endless reference to like objects became discontinued and transformed into the system of the scientifically ordered table. Here, the meaning of an object was to be known only by dint of its arrangement as a representation alongside, but comparatively different from, all other representations. The classical model uses external features, surfaces, and lines no longer to enable the chainlike alignment of things and beings for their comprehension by conjuncture (as in the Renaissance), but rather to substantiate the descriptive discrimination of the subtle differences between them and thus an analysis of comparison and measurement. In his study of plants, Heinrich abandons pressed examples for his own representative drawings accompanied by descriptions, since drawings maintain their form, while the real plants shrivel and fade (35). He describes plants and minerals according to their external qualities and, on referring to existing guides, discovers that his descriptions differ from others' that facilitate the arrangement of things according to the resemblances between certain exceptional features, while his enable things to be classified according to their lines and structure. Heinrich keeps a record of both kinds of descriptions even though he believes that the others result in the grouping together of plants that in their overall form are very different from one another (27-28).[26] Young Drendorf's attempts to amend classification systems very much aligns him with Lavater's reinvention of physiognomy.

---

[21] Bruford maintains that these expressions reveal the influence of Goethe's thought on Stifter (133).

[22] Risach's remarks also echo the notions of the German Romantic poet Novalis.

[23] "Der *Dichter* ist *Prophet der Schöpfung und der Fürsehung Gottes. Mittler zwischen der Natur und den Söhnen und Töchtern der Natur*" (227).

[24] See Aspetsberger 189-94; Glaser 12-14; Hohendahl 339, 341; Lorey 479-81; Seidler 218-40; Tielke 123-24; Tismar 58-61, 66, 70; Wagner 160. Both K.-D. Müller (216) and Tytler (253) maintain that the Asperhof is an extension of Risach's physiognomy. Belgum makes such a claim for other characters: "This manner of letting the interior and its arrangement speak for a character is repeated throughout the novel" (18). Stifter may well have gleaned this idea from Goethe who maintained – in Lavater's *Fragments* of all places – that an individual's acculturation of objects reveals that individual's character (see Gray, "Die Geburt" 120-21; "Sign and *Sein*" 325).

---

[25] Bark notes that Stifter refers to the botany of Carl von Linné and to the systematically comparable mineralogy of Friedrich Mohs (708).

[26] Wittkowski draws attention to the treatment of nature in the novel as a matter of "tireless observation" (81). More specifically, Whitinger believes Heinrich has "a tendency to reorder an experienced vastness artistically into a finite pattern conforming to an inner, preconceived ideal" ("Elements" 244). Cf. Lange (62).

Like Heinrich's studies of plants, minerals, and animals, physiognomy in *Der Nachsommer* also follows the same form as the classical structure of thought identified by Foucault and typified by Lavater's *Fragments*. Particular features are used as references to provide a consecutive arrangement of human objects according to relations of difference. The external features of the various characters of Stifter's novel create a harmonious unity of forms and elements that may at first appear to serve an endless association between all comparable people (Glaser 48; Stoessl 54; Tytler 240; cf. Keller 222-30; cf. G. Mayer 121-22). This sense of unity is also conveyed by the buildings and furniture of particular periods (87). However, on close inspection, these forms and elements are seen to establish discriminating distinctions between people. It is the resource of these differences that primarily facilitates the arrangement of all the characters in the novel and, subsequently, their comprehension in the reader's mind.

At first, many characters seem linked by common facial and physical attributes. I have already mentioned above the fact that Natalie's, Gustav's, Mathilde's, and Mathilde's mother's eyes, hair, and facial features are the same. But the attributes typical of the Maklodens / Taronas are not exclusive to them. Both Roland (216) and Tillberg's son (413) also have dark eyes and Julie Ingheim (209, 418) and her mother (210) have brown eyes, while Julie's are also large (209). However, Appolonia Ingheim (210, 418), Ingheim (219), certain country girls (570), Alfred (587), and his and Mathilde's father (587) all have blue eyes in common. And while Mathilde (195, 598), Heinrich's father (345, 651), Klotilde (522), Roland (549), and Gustav (660) are connected by dint of their sparkling (*glänzend*) eyes, Risach (476), the Princess (490), Heinrich's father (520), and those people with a feel for art (572) share the characteristic of clear (*klar*) eyes. Similarly, in addition to Mathilde's mother, Mathilde, Gustav, and Natalie, the characters Roland (184), Julie and Appolonia Ingheim (209), Heinrich's father (256), and Alfred (587) all have brown or dark hair, whereas Risach (41, 49, 113, 163, 168, 172, 627, 628), Simon (94, 171, 172), Haßberg (414), and Sandung (415) are connected by way of their white hair, as perhaps are Mathilde (193) and Heinrich's father (256) by their respective silver and white streaks. The physical attribute of glowing, rosy, or tanned cheeks also forms an association between Gustav (62, 113, 172, 300), Risach (172), Roland (184), Natalie (194, 244, 401, 663), Heinrich's father (520), Klotilde (522), Alfred (587), and Mathilde (597, 608, 620). Finally, it is said that Natalie and Roland's sweetheart are look-alikes (676). As well, further connections and associations can be made in the related realms of dress, posture, and gait. But as my above brief catalogue amply demonstrates, once laid out, these resemblances by no means make the characters of the novel especially comprehensible. Victor Lange refers to attributes among the characters that are equally as distinguishing as neutralizing (70). At first glance, there seems to be instead a confusing mosaic giving the vague impression that one character reflects another.[27]

True to Foucault's observations on the classical episteme, however, the meaning of the characters emerges once they are contextualized in a tabular order. The tabulation of the various characters occurs in the narration (and in the reader's imagination) in accordance with a contradistinctive arrangement of their external features. Just as in Lavater's *Fragments*, in Stifter's novel, the structure of the visible surfaces of one character's face is examined consecutively and comparatively with those of other characters by referring to the variables of lines, size and/or color of features, distinguishing marks, etc. This ultimately leads to a classification of those characters and their faces according to quantitative and qualitative discriminations.[28]

Such a tabular system of order is most immediately evident in *Der Nachsommer* among the female characters. The descriptions of Julie and Apollonia Ingheim proceed consecutively and in exactly the same manner as each other. They are arranged between brief comparisons both to women in general and to Natalie, and precede a further brief description of the girls' mother and a final comparison with Mathilde. The text refers to how old each of the two girls appears to be, as well as to their hair, foreheads, eyes, cheeks, mouths, figures, and manner. While Julie and Apollonia resemble each other by sharing certain traits, these traits are also differentiated from each other. Julie appears "older"; Apollonia's brown hair is "lighter" and its arrangement is "prettier" since, unlike Julie's, it is combed away from her forehead; Apollonia's blue eyes are "smaller," "simpler, more good-natured, and more loyal" than Julie's brown eyes; Apollonia's cheeks and mouth are "still finer than her sister's"; her frame is "slightly smaller"; and, while Julie's manner is "natural ... dignified," and "more gracious," Apollonia's is "more trusting and more delightful" (209-10). But the effect of this descriptive comparison of the two sisters is made comprehensible only by further differentiations within the table of women (cf. Glaser 48; see also Wittkowski 83-85). Next to the roses – which in this novel always stand as an allusion to women[29] – Julie is slim and noble (209), whereas, next to the two girls, and in spite of having the same brown hair (209), Natalie's beauty is "infinitely greater" (210), she is so "much higher, true, clear, and beautiful, that any comparison was futile" (210). Elsewhere, Natalie is even "immeasurably" (193) or "extraordinarily beautiful" (338). Similarly, at "around 40 years old," the still healthy and beautiful, yet "too pudgy," Frau Ingheim is contrasted with Mathilde who is "significantly older" and "seemed once to have looked like Natalie" (210).

---

[27] See also Amann (*Studie* 92n314); Buggert (223); Killy (98); Lindau (75-77); Lunding (79); and Schuller (31).

[28] Cf. Wittkowski's discussion of the principle of gradation or gradual order (77-91, esp. 84, 85, 87, 89, 90).

The two Ingheim girls and their mother are thus primarily known by their location in the order of the table of women founded on the descriptions of external features and manners. From their appearance, the narrator concludes that Julie has "an eminent and appealing charm about her" (209), that they "can be enchanting," and that, according to his city friends, "they are both captivating creatures," but that neither is a match for Natalie who radiates "something like a deep happiness" (210). Likewise, though Frau Ingheim's appearance clearly shows that she "belongs to the so-called superior social circles," she is eclipsed by Mathilde, who is now the very "image of tranquility and ... of forgiveness" (210). Julie, Apollonia, and their mother are without doubt all highly esteemed— the Ingheims "belong to the educated" and are the epitome of "simplicity, composure, und modesty" (219) – but in the overall scheme they are deemed inferior to Natalie and Mathilde. Their location in the order of women reveals the existence of two types of people in the same domain, themselves and the likes of Natalie and Mathilde: "Thus these two kinds of people sat at the same table and moved about the same room, really two kinds of people."[30]

---

[29] Indicating Lavater's influence – though possibly also that of Novalis's ideal representation of transcendence in the *blaue Blume* – Risach compares the faces of elderly women with fading roses: "'Habt Ihr denn nie eine jener alten Frauen gesehen', sagte mein Begleiter, 'die in ihrer Jugend sehr schön gewesen waren und sich lange kräftig erhalten haben? Sie gleichen diesen Rosen. Wenn sie selbst schon unzählige kleine Falten in ihrem Angesichte haben, so ist doch noch zwischen den Falten die Anmut herrschend und eine sehr schöne, liebe Farbe'" (50). I have already mentioned above the likening both of Natalie and of Mathilde to the rose. See also Kläui (91-93); Oertel (53-68); Oertel Sjögren (1972, 20-35); Requadt (34-49); Wedekind (415-25); and Wittkowski (111-113).

Just as with women in the novel, the resemblances in the external appearances of some of the older adult male characters enables their comprehension by comparison, differentiation, and subsequent arrangement. For example, Risach, Simon, and Heinrich's father are orderable by the degree of the whiteness of their hair. Simon's hair is whiter than Risach's (94), and both he and his employer appear to become whiter (171, 172). Since Risach explains that his hair whitened only after he settled down at the Asperhof (627), his retreat from bureaucratic society and lifelong disappointment in love, it is fair to say that his hair is as much a sign of his reasoned resignation to and reconciliation with life's limitations, and thus of a desire for simplicity, as it is of his old age.[31] The whiteness of Simon's hair signals his purity (94), but his one-dimensionality – he is referred to reductively as "the white gardener" (107) – renders his purity less substantial than Risach's simplicity. Likewise, Heinrich's father's white-streaked hair fills Heinrich with awe (256), but the amount of respect this partially white appearance earns can only potentiate the respect that Risach's full head of white hair commands; even Heinrich's father says Risach is known for his intellect (166). In the table of old white-haired men, whereas Simon and Heinrich's father respectively have too much or as yet too little to show, Risach strikes the right balance;[32] Risach's appearance is in harmony with his surroundings (182) and he emits "not something aristocratic" but "something independent" ("nicht ... etwas Vornehmes"; "etwas Selbstständiges" 182).[33] Again, it is by a Lavaterian attention to and ordering of contradistinctive physical appearances that the characters in Stifter's novel are primarily known.[34]

---

[30] "So saßen diese zwei Abteilungen von Menschen an demselben Tische, und bewegten sich in demselben Zimmer, wirklich zwei Abteilungen von Menschen" (211).

[31] It is only toward the resolution of the novel, once Risach's legacy has taken shape in Heinrich – and Gustav – that old age leaves its mark on the old man and he becomes "a gray head" ("ein graues Haupt" 647).

[32] Walter-Schneider remarks that the white-haired Risach "approximates the figure of Lear in Heinrich's Lear-narrative" ("Das Licht" 387).

[33] From the extreme brevity of the descriptions of the remaining adult male figures, it is impossible to deduce any exact or far-reaching meaning concerning their characters. Ingheim "schien ein kenntnisvoller Mann zu sein" (210), Eustach is "ein ruhiges, gefälliges Wesen" (82), Tillberg has a friendly face (413), his son is slim and has lively dark eyes (413), Haßberg is a small man with white hair (414), Baron von Wachten's son is a young man of average height and many pleasant qualities (415), and Sandung has snow-white hair (415).

But while Lavater's physiognomy is shown to be typical of the classical structure of thought in that it arranges the external features of the face in a specifically tabular classification, his work is also innovative for his time in the way his descriptions of heads and faces prefigure the modern episteme by subordinating the external features to internal relations. Foucault discovered the same subtle modification occurring in the works of a small number of French natural historians who relate the external appearances of living beings – and consequently their tabulation – to the life-function of their organs. In the case of Lavater's physiognomic treatises, I see the external features being used as a transparency not of any internal organic structure, but of abstract social relations such as one's rank or role in society. The facial features informing the structure of human nature are thus predicated on the preconceived social function of type or identity, what I term, *the specter of the face*. It is the 'observation' of the social function of a type through the transparency of the face that individuals must take their place in the taxonomy of humanity that reveals and confirms the knowledge of their nature. A similar shift toward a growing dependency on more functional resemblances – and thus a similar anticipation of modernity – to that in Lavater's work occurs in Heinrich's empirical studies of animals. Examined in the context of this epistemic shift to the subordination of externalities to abstract social functions, Heinrich's zoological observations reveal an agenda highly reminiscent of Lavater's physiognomical meditations

---

However, the general similarities of some to Risach imply that the minor adult males act as dim reverberations of his stature and wisdom. Glaser sees the minor characters in general as defined by their social role or relation to the central characters (59-61). Only Risach's brother-in-law is singled out as particularly unremarkable. Although the brother-in-law has "eine angenehme Körpererscheinung," Risach had always imagined his sister's eventual husband would be "allerherrlichst" (581). Risach's estimation of his brother-in-law's mediocrity could not be any clearer: "daß er nicht ein Mann war, der durch hohe Begabung und den Schwung seiner Seele die Schwester zu einem himmlischen Glücke emporgeführt hatte" (584). Berman remarks that the descriptions of Simon and Roland merely "reflect their social inferiority vis-à-vis the *grand seigneur* [Risach]" ("Authority" 109). For inferences regarding the minor characters in the novel, see Oertel Sjögren (*The Marble Statue* 72-87). See below for a brief comment on the roving artist Roland.

[34] Further direct contradistinctive comparisons of physical appearances occur between Risach and Gustav (113), Natalie as the girl in the theater box and Klotilde (161-62), Eustach and Roland (216), the "common people" and "the so-called educated" (291-92), Gustav and city youths (376), and the various members of rural society (413-16).

that is also at once tinged with ironic reservation.

Early on in the novel, Heinrich is practically haunted by physiognomical sensation after coming across the carcass of a stag (32). He interprets the creature's reproach for its human slayers in its eyes and face (31). He goes on to describe the stag as "a noble fallen hero" and "a pure being" and similarly excuses the work of the hunting dogs by means of their "lean, jumping, and quick forms" (32). Heinrich accounts not only for the animals' "distinguishing physical characteristics," but also for their "habits and purpose," that is, the structure of their lives, and again notices a marked divergence between his effort and established classification systems (32). Like Lavater and his human subjects, Heinrich explicitly modifies those systems that rely solely on descriptions of external features by making such observations cohere with the life-functions of the animals. From Heinrich's perspective, an animal even has a job or vocation ("Beruf" 32) – stags are *heroes* and dogs are *hunters* – and thus a rank or role that predicates the knowledge of their features and of their respective natures. The episode in which Heinrich decodes the countenance of a dead stag follows much the same process that enables Lavater to tabulate and 'know' the nature of certain priests and poets, farmers and foreigners, and so on. The appearance of the stag is subordinated by an abstract relation or function. In cultural history and mythology, the figure of the stag is an almost entirely positive symbol that stands for the dawn, regeneration, purity, longevity, plenty, creativity, spirituality, ardor, swiftness, grace, beauty, prudence, and acute hearing, and is linked with poetry and music (Chevalier/Gheerbrant 920-23; Cooper 158; Matthews, *Herder* 181-82; Tresidder 62-63). The stag is traditionally regarded "as a solar animal or as an intermediary between heaven and earth" and "in antiquity and among the Celts as a psychopomp (spirit guide)" (Matthews, *Herder* 181) or "conductor of souls" (Chevalier/Gheerbrant 922). As well, "Following the hunted deer or stag often leads to symbolic situations, and the stag can also be a messenger of the gods or heavenly powers" (Cooper 158). Stags and deer appear "as supernatural messengers or guides who show heroes the path to their goals" (Tresidder 63). It is by just such notions of the sun- or Christ-like 'heroic' function of a stag as intermediary between heaven and earth that Heinrich may recognize in its appearance its 'pure' and 'noble' nature.

Yet in the broader context of the novel, the observation of the figure of the dead stag has an ambiguous effect. On the one hand, it reflects favorably on Heinrich. As the narrative *hero* and someone who is concerned with physiognomy – and in this sense a *conductor of souls*, so to speak – Heinrich is in a relation of sameness with the stag within the symbolic economy of the novel. Consequently, when Heinrich recognizes in the stag a highly esteemed nature while seeing its murderers as blinded by the thrill of killing, he not only perceives these human killers as all the more "disgusting" (32), but also confers on himself the same characteristics of 'purity' and 'nobility' that he finds in his fellow *hero* and *conductor of souls*. Heinrich's physiognomical sensation thus seems to earn him a set of highly commendable characteristics and at the same time pronounces his *superiority* over certain other people in regard to knowing the world. On the other hand, the response to the stag also reflects on Heinrich in a foreboding way. That the stag has been killed intimates both that most humans are in the habit of failing to recognize greatness, and that, even at this early stage in the novel, and for all his apparent 'purity' and potential 'nobility,' *the physiognomical hero also risks going to the dogs*.[35] Thus while reiterating knowledge-systems, Stifter subtly questions both their efficacy and the genuineness of the individual intellectual authority's intention objectively to know the world. He portrays physiognomy as a kind of scholarly system for compiling and classifying information that assists the comprehension of the object of study and confirms the authority of the observer. Yet at the same time, he does this in a way that alludes to the possibly contrived and self-promoting, fragile, or, perhaps even, pointless aspects of such systems.

Like Lavater's physiognomy and Heinrich's observations of animals, the classification of faces in Stifter's *Der Nachsommer* also relies for its method on the subordination of the visible external features to the requisites of an abstract function. Indeed, Risach maintains that certain people are born to do certain things (500). The knowledge and position of the Ingheim girls and their mother in the order of women (see above) are the effect of the dimensions of an *enchanting* or *captivating* face and their modification as the transparency of an a priori identity-function. Essentially, as members of fashionable, polite, and educated society, the Ingheims are thoroughly modern people. Their faces, bodies, and demeanor are a measure of this function of *modern people* and in turn confirm the 'simplicity,' 'composure,' and 'modesty' that comprise their nature and assign them a relatively esteemed place in the taxonomy of humanity. Horst Albert Glaser views the characters in *Der Nachsommer* simply as allegorical "figurines" (16). Christine Anneliese Oertel discusses whether they are types or individuals (167-69), concluding that they are types but for a variety of effects (192); they are "realizations," representations, "expressions of [a] rôle," a "function," "manifestations of certain ideal qualities," and "foils" (192). G. Mayer considers the figures of the novel to be simplified, universal "bearers of a function" ("Funktionsträger," 125). Paul Hankamer also sees Stifter's characters as moral portraits not of individual personalities but of archetypes limited by a given moral order (119, 120; see also Gillespie 315). My understanding of the meaning of the characters differs particularly from Oertel's and Hankamer's insofar as I do not see the characters simply as ciphers or stand-ins for certain moral qualities. Rather, I maintain that these qualities effected by the face are motivated not for their own sake, that the knowledge – supposedly confirmed or expressed by the face – of who the characters are as moral people can be accrued only because their faces are already assigned a social identity and that this fact of identity – of who they are as sociocultural people – limits or prescribes the subsequent moral knowledge to be gained from any face.

---

[35] The irony of this situation is only sharpened when one also considers the possible allusion to the mythical figure of Acteon in this scene.

The example of the Ingheims also reveals that, while some women are known to be commendable by means of their appearance, other women are more commendable still. First, there are such worthy female characters as the Ingheim women, or Heinrich's mother – who is like a fairy (12) – or Risach's sister – who has "beautiful eyelids with long lashes" (576) – or Risach's wife – who has simply "a pleasant figure" (626) – or Klotilde – who has a "nice face" (521) and is compared with a rose (256), but is second in beauty to Natalie (162). Then there is another category, or second type, ranked above the first and comprised especially of Natalie and Mathilde, but also Mathilde's mother – whose "beautiful brown hair," "deep dark large black eyes" (587), and "beautiful friendly" hands (615) confirm she is "delightful, friendly, and kind" (601) – and the Princess – who has "delightful, friendly, and clever features" (288), an "extremely elegant form" (290), "clear and delightful eyes" and a "very fine" smile (490), and, thus, a face that continues to grow in stature (375). Joseph Vogl points out that in *Der Nachsommer* the linguistic outlines referring to the graphic outlines of bodies are abstractions devoid of specific details that provide ready surfaces onto which moral, social, cultural, etc., designs can be projected (300-01, 306). Natalie's generally beautiful features give the impression that she is "friendly" and "delightful" (159; 201) and "pure and noble" (632). They combine to indicate not just the fact that she is physically perfect, but that she has a unique character and soul: "Her forehead, nose, mouth, eyes, and cheeks had exactly ... something free, lofty, simple, tender, and yet powerful that indicated a perfectly formed body as well as a distinct will and a distinct soul."[36] Her features contain "such a pure and fine spirituality" ("Eine solche reine, feine Geistigkeit") that expresses "the deepest soul" ("die tiefste Seele" 465). Her form is "the most beautiful" ("das Schönste" 465), and she is – once again – "a pure, deep, and beautiful human soul" ("eine reine, tiefe, schöne menschliche Seele" 466). Mathilde's appearance is more particular in that it substantiates several aspects of human nature. Her wrinkles convey her consoling and trusting nature (395). Her face issues an air of tranquility and forgiveness (210; 374), of reconciliation with life's ups and downs, benevolence, and deep satisfaction (375), and of charm and sadness (628). While the features of the first group of worthy women are defined and assist their classification in terms of their roles as participants in *contemporary* society, the women of the second, superior group either stand apart from or operate without such a confine.

Just as the meaning of the Ingheims is known by the transparency of their faces with their function as *modern people*, so too are the superior positions of Natalie and Mathilde in the table of women the corollary of the measurement of their faces and bodies in relation to a prior abstract social function. In the case of this second, more highly ranked group, the external features that enable their arrangement and comprehension are described not in the context of a modern educated social elite, but in analogy to art (see also Vogl 300; cf. Schößler 40-41 & 47-49; cf. Oertel Sjögren, *The Marble Statue* 4). The text mentions five times Heinrich's sensation on first seeing the face of the young woman in the carriage – Natalie. He senses that the human face or form is the "most beautiful," "best," "noblest," "highest," and "worthiest" subject of art.[37] Furthermore, the word *Bild* – the German word for "picture," "painting," "drawing," "portrait," or "image" – is applied expressly in definitions of three of the novel's principal characters. Heinrich recollects the girl at the theater – Natalie – as "an indefinite dark *picture* of beauty" (my emphasis; "ein unbestimmtes dunkles Bild von Schönheit" 162) and later sees in the classical marble statue of Nausicaa "Natalie's beautiful *image*" (my emphasis; "das schöne Bild Nataliens" 557). On regarding Mathilde, Heinrich recalls the *image* of fading roses that Risach uses to portray elderly women,[38] and he interprets her face as "a *picture* of tranquility and forgiveness" (my emphasis; "ein Bild der Ruhe und ... der Vergebung" 210; "ein Bild der Vergebung" 374). Likewise, he evaluates Gustav as "the *picture* of perfect goodness and purity" (my emphasis; "das Bild der vollkommensten Güte und Reinheit" 300). Indeed, Natalie, Mathilde, and Gustav's faces are preceded by their doubles in existing timeless examples of highly acclaimed objects of art. Not only does Heinrich recognize in the statue from the Greek colony of Cumae the simultaneous representation of Natalie (557), but the above-cited qualities indicated by Natalie's features are exactly the same as those perceived on the women's faces portrayed on the antique cameos belonging to Heinrich's father (399). Particularly her head and neck resemble those on the cameos (400). Heinrich also speculates that Mathilde had once looked like the older women on the cameos (400), and conjectures that, while Gustav does not fully resemble the "beautiful and simple," "especially noble and remarkable" faces of the helmeted youths depicted on the cameos, he approximates them more than any other boy does (375-76) and would soon look just like them (400). Finally, having already arrived at the same conclusion, Heinrich assumes that his father also sees in Natalie's beauty her likeness with the cameos (641).[39]

---

[36] "Die Stirne, die Nase, der Mund, die Augen, die Wangen hatten genau ... das Freie, das Hohe, das Einfache, das Zarte und doch das Kräftige, welches auf einen vollständig gebildeten Körper hinweist, aber auch auf einen eigentümlichen Willen und eine eigentümliche Seele" (399).

---

[37] "Ich dachte mir ... ob denn nicht eigentlich das menschliche Angesicht der *schönste* Gegenstand zum Zeichnen wäre" (143); "Damals hatte ich gedacht, daß das menschliche Angesicht der *beste* Gegenstand für das Zeichnen sein dürfte" (160); "Ich hatte ja sogar damals gedacht, daß das menschliche Angesicht etwa der *edelste* Gegenstand für die Zeichnungskunst sein dürfte" (231); "[ich begriff] wieder ... daß der Mensch doch der *höchste* Gegenstand für die Zeichnungskunst sei" (247); "Es habe mir nur ... eingeleuchtet, daß das menschliche Antlitz der *würdigste* Gegenstand für Zeichnungen sei" (381) – my emphasis in all instances.

[38] "da ich sie sah, fiel mir das *Bild* ein, welches mein Gastfreund einmal über manche alternde Frauen von verblühenden Rosen hergenommen hatte" (192); "Als ich Mathilden das erste mal sah, fiel mir das *Bild* der verblühenden Rose ein, welches mein Gastfreund von ihr gebraucht hatte" (374) – my emphasis in both instances.

Heinrich sees the majority of his contemporaries as, in contrast to Natalie and those like her, unworthy of depiction in art.[40] He compares the heads of the old men on his father's cameos with those of the old men around him, concluding that "the two were not exactly comparable" since "they showed the differences of the human races" (375). He abandons any desire to paint these faces since he often sees in them only such unappealing characteristics as "envy," "greediness," "decrepitude," and "unimaginativeness" (375). The comparison between the widowed Princess and the Ingheim girls' mother in light of their respective relation to art best encapsulates the existence of two types of people in Stifter's novel. While the outward physical appearance of each of the two women is considered beautiful and signifies competence and erudition, it is the Princess's features – and consequently her character – that earn the greater appraisal. According to an art critic and acquaintance of the Princess, only Rembrandt would have been able to reproduce "the fine tones and the artistic shades of her face" ("die feinen Töne und die kunstgemäßen Übergänge ihres Angesichtes" 288; 375). In contrast, Heinrich points out that the Ingheim mother's figure is too pudgy for her ever to be the subject of a drawing (210). Thus, physical description assigns the Ingheim mother to a lower rank than the Princess who, conceivably attractive enough to have been a model for Rembrandt, and as "one of the most extraordinary beauties in the higher circles" ("in den höheren Kreisen eine der außerordentlichsten Schönheiten" 288), must surely approximate the exemplification of classical art ideals in the Maklodens / Taronas. Certainly, the a priori duplication of Natalie and her like in art sets them far apart from their contemporaries. Heinrich surmises from Natalie's face that she belongs to a "bygone," "different and more independent" "*race*" (my emphasis; "Geschlecht" 400). Indeed, the knowledge and position of Natalie and her like in the order of the characters in the novel is the effect of the dimensions of the *most beautiful* face as the transparency of an identity-function. Since she is comparable to the subjects of the ideal figures of classical art – her head is "so classical" ("so antik" 400; see also K.-D. Müller 220) – Natalie's outward appearance equates the function of those *classical people* who transcend time and, thus, confirm her 'pure' and 'noble' nature and concomitant supremacy among all people.

---

[39] The word *Bild* (or *Bildnis*) is used in definitions of two more marginal female figures. Heinrich's mother is described as the "portrait of goodness" ("Bildnis des Guten" 11) and like a fairy portrayed in the children's picture books (12). Risach describes his mother "as the image of good housekeeping" and "as the image of patience, gentleness, order, and constancy" ("als das Bild der größten häuslichen Reinheit ... als das Bild des Duldens, der Sanftmut, des Ordnens und des Bestehens" 582). Though positive, it is clear that the references to children's books and good housekeeping confine the two characters solely to the domestic sphere and, so, these descriptions differ from those that frame Natalie, Mathilde, and Gustav. For the connection between "'Bildnis,' 'Bild,' 'Vorbild,' and 'Bildung,'" see Stillmark (96-97).

[40] Schmitt explains that the surviving examples of Stifter's art are largely comprised of landscapes and studies of forests, and that there is no indication of his having attempted portraits (264-65, 284, 294). For Stifter's relation to the fine arts, see also Hallamore (403-04); and Wagner-Rieger. For examples of artists whose portrait paintings may have influenced Stifter's literary portraits, see Rehm, *Nachsommer* (53, 60-61); and Wedekind (403).

Heinrich comes to recognize the apparent timeless significance of Natalie's, Mathilde's, and Gustav's faces – and so also to realize the limitations of contemporary faces – only after navigating a series of learning experiences that impart to him the appreciation of a standard of artistic beauty inherited from the ancient Greeks and Romans. Thus Stifter's text, as well as echoing Lavater's *Physiognomical Fragments*, also shares with them several aspects of the historical theories of art developed by Johann Joachim Winckelmann in the mid eighteenth century. Several commentators on *Der Nachsommer* have already pointed toward the influence of Winckelmann on Stifter, but few provide details.[41] Yet the style of the display spaces, the Homeric allusions, the references to the Greek and Roman customs of physical exercise and swimming, the tale of the discovery of Greek art in Italy, the assertion of the dichotomy between Greece and the contemporary period and the aspiration of German art to reach the standard of Greek art not merely by imitation but by the recognition of the spirit in cultural heritage, the expression of lifelike qualities in statues, and remarks concerning 'stillness in motion,' the clear lines and meaningful shadows of art objects, drapery, or the fact that beauty is to be found in the entirety of an object and not its parts, all point directly to Winckelmann.

---

[41] See, e.g., Aluf (132); Blasberg (329 [esp. n5], 337, 363); Bollnow (24-25); Hankamer (124); Lange (35); Lengauer (268-73); Lunding (77-79); G. Mayer (121); Rehm, *Nachsommer* (50-51); Schlaffer/Schlaffer (116, 118, 120n9); Schößler (45 & 48); Schuller (43n45); Seidler (187-88); Walter-Schneider, "Das Unzulängliche" (338).

Because of their prior function as representative physical copies of classical people, the examples set particularly by Natalie's, Mathilde's, and Gustav's physical appearances rank foremost among Heinrich's intellectual pursuits as a pedagogical concern or as an essential element of the knowledge requisite to Heinrich's development. As narrator and hero of the story of his own formation as an upstanding, educated individual, it is Heinrich's obligation to demonstrate a skilled ability to observe the sociocultural functions of things and people, to classify and arrange them, and to reveal their meaning.[42] Heinrich must learn the ways of the physiognomist. He must develop his physiognomical sensation since, as Mathilde remarks – again echoing Lavater – the copying of human faces forms one of the essential elements of education (397). Indeed, Stifter's novel signals the successful integration of a young man by showing how Heinrich dedicates himself to the study of art, to the copying of existing examples of portraits, and to the practical application of his learning in the observation of human characteristics in the surfaces and features of real faces.[43] As a keen physiognomic observer of the faces of the people around him, Heinrich turns particularly to works of art to improve his powers of observation. He studies pictures of girls' heads in the imperial art collection, tries to reproduce as a line drawing a painting owned by his father of a boy reading (161), copies paintings and draws portraits of girls, men, old people, and women from memory or sketches parts of the body based on busts and casts he has seen (162), and examines his father's cameos (375). He also practices painting with live models, using Simon and Clara, the Asperhof servants (299), and others (374). He even keeps a catalogue of faces (299). Heinrich's father teaches him about colors (161) and commends him particularly on his drawings of heads (285). Heinrich gradually learns how to draw the intricacies of the human face since he is fond of capturing physiognomic details such as "loveliness," "modesty," or "roguishness" (301), and he pays ever more attention to the limbs and faces of figures in paintings and how artistic reproduction conveys their various qualities (323). He eventually realizes the physiognomical dimensions of a portrait of a girl's head by Hans Holbein the Younger that he used to copy for drawing practice (367). Finally, he begins to draw heads differently; he looks for the inner being by concentrating more on the soul "expressed in the lines and the tones" (376). Heinrich's proficiency in artistic and physiognomic matters is demonstrated in his role as a narrator who reflects on the marble statue (301-03) and the cameos (367-69) that together prove so instrumental in assessing Natalie, Mathilde, and Gustav.

---

[42] Heinrich's foremost literary precedent, Goethe's eponymous Wilhelm Meister, must also demonstrate physiognomical ability (see Niekerk 13-14).

[43] Heinrich's education also includes understanding the meaning of clothing (Wagner 148); the treatment of the "piety and virtue" of simple attire is reminiscent of Lavater (Tytler 220).

Heinrich's ability to put his artistic learning to the practical ends of discovering and assessing people's qualities as contained in the knowledge of the features of their faces is a clear gauge of his success and apparent aptitude as an artist-intellectual. Soon after his discovery of the analogy between Natalie's face and those of the ancients on his father's cameos, Heinrich declares his love for and proposes to Natalie and, indeed, their engagement is readily approved. This is the surest narrative indication of the protagonist having reached a certain maturity in the eyes of his immediate elders and betters, of having attained a sufficient intellectual standing to be granted membership to – what is for all intents and purposes – an exclusive family. Furthermore, when Heinrich goes on to record an analogy between the best available example of artistic expression, the marble statue, and Natalie's beauty, the full consequence of Heinrich's cultural development nears completion. The statue, of course, is the figure of Nausicaa who in Homer's *Odyssey* discovers and helps the shipwrecked hero Odysseus. "She gives him food, drink, and clothing, *shows him the way* to the city, and advises him on how to behave to her parents" (Hornblower/Spawforth 1029; my emphasis). Heinrich's appreciation of the statue of Nausicaa produces a similarly positive result for the hero of Stifter's novel as the original character does for the hero of Homer's epic fiction. Nausicaa acts as a conduit facilitating the way toward heroic fulfillment. Indeed, by way of his engagement with the Nausicaa-like Natalie, Heinrich is due to inherit both land and material property of considerable value. For the observation of the physical analogy between Nausicaa and Natalie insinuates in the people closest to Heinrich the constant potential of heightened cultural awareness and achievement. Stifter's protagonist and narrator opportunely provides the knowledge of others resembling the ancients, confirms their superiority, and by dint of his ability to recognize and reiterate that superiority, asserts his own claim to a position of cultural authority. Stifter thus demonstrates how symbolic authority (or art appreciation) is rewarded socially (by marriage into an influential family) and economically (in the form of a dowry, heirlooms, and realty).[44]

However, while Stifter depicts Heinrich's growing ability to make artistic, physiognomic, and socioeconomic connections, he also punctuates his text with ironic instances and self-conscious asides that question or qualify the genuineness and scale of his protagonist's success. On the one hand, Heinrich takes pains through artistic training and attention to faces to develop his potential. On the other hand, he makes mistakes, is uncertain, and is slow to make connections.[45] He is late in realizing the worth of various cultural objects (K.-D. Müller 217-18). Many of his own artistic endeavors end in failure or reveal shortcomings. He is unsuccessful in his attempt to copy the painting of a boy reading (161). He is better at natural history than at artistic drawing (272). He makes mistakes in his sketches (285). He does not dare draw Risach, Eustach, or Gustav because he doubts he would succeed (299). He admits to being unable to reproduce faces accurately (321) and to never being certain whether he succeeds in reproducing the features of his human subjects (381-82). Often his attempts destroy the inner substance he wishes to convey, rendering his pictures "soulless" (376-77). Indeed, the novel ends with a discussion not of one of Heinrich's attempts, but of a picture by Roland (678). Heinrich does not always fair any better in the realm of physiognomy. On first meeting Risach, he does not realize he is talking with the gentleman of the house and he is uncertain as to his interlocutor's age (41, 49). Risach appears strange to Heinrich (68, 113, 182), as does Simon, though in the case of the latter he cannot say why ("Der alte Gärtner ... war ebenfalls ungewöhnlich gekleidet, nur konnte ich bei ihm das Ungewöhnliche nicht finden" 94). On one occasion he is uncertain whether Natalie's cheeks are naturally red or whether she is blushing ("Ich wußte nicht, waren die Wangen des Mädchens überhaupt so rot, oder war es errötet" 194). On two other occasions, when he does reach conclusions concerning the meaning of Mathilde's and

---

[44] Lorey points out how, in the "symbiosis of man, animal, and plant," the order of life promulgated by Risach "has not only idealistic and aesthetic, but also economic value" (479). For the connection between aesthetic concerns, material possessions, and sociocultural authority, see also Aspetsberger (180, 209-10); Berman ("Authority"); Jacobs/Krause (163); Tielke (128-31); and Wagner (150-51).

[45] His literary predecessor, Wilhelm Meister, also makes mistakes (see Niekerk 16, 17, 21).

Gustav's faces, he is at a loss as to explain why or how ("Ich weiß nicht, warum mir in den Tagen dieser Ausdruck schon mehrere Male einfiel" 210; "Ich weiß nicht, welcher innre Zug von Neigung mich zu dem Jünglinge hinwendete" 300). In his defense, Heinrich explains that he is able to judge young men but cannot say anything about young women since he has not spent much time with them (387) – again echoing Lavater. Nonetheless, Heinrich consistently fails to make basic connections between faces. While he is able to imagine Risach's suggestion of the connection between an older woman's (/Mathilde's) appearance and a rose blossom (192), he does not recognize the face of the young woman at the theater (Natalie) as the same as that of one of the two remarkable women he saw in a carriage one summer (160-61). When Natalie does seem familiar to him, he cannot remember where he has seen her before (202) and has to be prompted by Risach before realizing that he might have seen her with Mathilde in the passing carriage (231). It also comes down to Natalie to reveal to Heinrich that she was the young woman in the theater box, and even then he has difficulty believing the two are one and the same: "'No, you are as blossoming as a rose, and that girl was pale like a white lily.'"[46] He is shown to be ever more her physiognomical junior when, after he admits to not having recognized her upon her arrival at the Asperhof, she reveals having recognized him (453). In fact, even though he claims to have accurately read Natalie's thoughts from the expression on her face ("'I knew it, I knew it'"), Heinrich continues having difficulty interpreting her features even after they have become engaged ("I could not tell what Natalie thought about the people's clear demonstration of opinion").[47] Thus, while Heinrich endeavors to realize his initial potential for physiognomical observation, he remains beset with problems (cf. Tytler 297). His ultimately lacking or inconsistent proficiency intimates that the expertise of those who accrue knowledge from the face is limited or unreliable and that specifically Heinrich is yet to mature.[48]

---

[46] "'Nein, Ihr seid so blühend wie eine Rose, und jenes Mädchen war blaß wie eine weiße Lilie'" (452).

[47] "'Ich wußte es, ich wußte es'" (474); "Wie Natalie über diese Kundgebungen der Leute dachte, konnte ich nicht erkennen" (511).

[48] Walter-Schneider maintains that Heinrich's lack of narrative imagination and of perception reflects Stifter's skepticism regarding knowledge ("Das Unzulängliche" 321-23, 328-29). Tytler also remarks that "although Heinrich is reasonably observant, his vision is still conditioned by his conventional attitudes. Indeed,

Heinrich's participation in the gathering and dissemination of information that ultimately leads to his accession to a position of privilege and symbolic authority is thus subverted by ironic elements that reveal how those intellectual pursuits, which expand the vaults of knowledge and elevate the standing of bright and gifted individuals, are contrived in a tenuous manner. Small sees Heinrich as "a producer of networks of signs, or signifying systems [whose production] seems to be the end in itself" (9). However, Heinrich lines up physiognomic knowledge not for knowledge's sake, but in his own self-interest and – codependently – in the interests of a select few. As Peter Uwe Hohendahl points out, individual interests and cultural traditions complement one another in Stifter's novel (347). Applying the physiognomical system that Heinrich uses to advance his fortunes in the world of *Der Nachsommer* to the appearance of Heinrich himself shows that he is not a prodigy (in the artistic field), that his success is not so much the fruit of genial spirit as it is the contrived result particularly of one man's – namely, Risach's – projection and calculated intervention for the sake of his own agenda of continuing cultural convention. On the one hand, Stifter invokes physiognomy in regard to the protagonist – whom one expects to succeed – to reveal that, if one is not born into success and cultural privilege, it is possible to cultivate and construct them, that it is possible to develop the necessary artistic sensitivity and physiognomical sensation to insinuate oneself in the realm of symbolic exchange. On the other hand, just as in the episode with the dead stag, Stifter treats the hero's own physiognomy ambiguously, questioning the credibility of his eventual success, and intimating that it depends on an heirless Risach fostering a new approved generation in the cultural field. Indeed, Stifter's sizable and complex contribution to the Bildungsroman tradition is a document of how the emergence of the modern artist-intellectual is a matter not of self-cultivation, but of the symbolic workings of the dominant intellectual class. Cultural analyst Edward Said points to the heroes of the seminal novels of the modern period to demonstrate the purpose of intellectual activity as being the advancement of unfettered and critical

---

it is clear that his social background has prevented him from seeing the world around him with anything more than a superficial gaze" (291). I believe Vogl's assertion of Heinrich's "confident look" ("Sicherheit des Blicks" 298) is inaccurate and K.-D. Müller's matter-of-fact reference to Heinrich's "gift of observation" ("Gabe der Beobachtung" 216) and "acuity for making observations" ("Schärfung des Beobachtungsvermögens" 218) remains contestable.

thought (11-23, esp. 17). But this is less of a concern in Heinrich's progress than his obtaining the right kind of thought, or learning the consecrated mind-set. Franziska Schößler observes that Heinrich can accomplish a study of the characters' bodies only once he has learnt or has been integrated into Risach's authoritarian and hierarchical order (85; see also Amann, "Zwei Thesen" 176; Aspetsberger 198). Klaus-Detlef Müller sees Heinrich's preparation beginning with his experience of his father's collecting (214; see also Belgum 17). Certainly the protagonist's intellectual activity amounts to the reproduction of the older generation's order in a subsequent generation (Schößler 194-99; see also Jacobs/Krause 162, 164). By cohering the image of classical people as found in art with a certain select group of people in the physiognomic order of all people, and by denying that image to others among his contemporaries, Heinrich reflects and recognizes the greatness of some and the subordination of others. In this way, Heinrich is effected legitimation in sociocultural organization despite his questionable proficiency. Stifter thus portrays the intellectual to be occupied with the acquisition, production, and distribution of knowledge in order to consolidate the means by which those who wish to enter the esteemed field of cultural and intellectual production are recognized.

The very first explicit indication in the novel that the face serves as a means of assessing someone's character or vocation and, consequently, their place in the order of humanity, is not only brief, but – considering the generally benevolent use of physiognomy in the novel – also happens to refer to the protagonist Heinrich in a surprisingly doubtful fashion. The members of Heinrich's family concur that they could not find any distinguishing feature on his face from which to deduce his calling in life (16). Thus the first instance of physiognomy is one that refers to a lack of substance. But Heinrich's father insists that Heinrich will develop some role or other out of this "uncertainty" (18). In fact, these preliminary observations of Heinrich's indistinctness are offset later by positive remarks by Risach and reportedly by the Drendorfs' neighbor in the city. Not long after Heinrich's discovery of the beauty of the marble statue, Risach claims that he had always thought that Heinrich would attain a high level of appreciation for art since beautiful forces are in him striving for fulfillment (313). Twice Risach states that he knew at first sight that Heinrich would become Natalie's groom (633, 666) – in the second instance Risach even alludes to his "eye of a professional" ("der Geschäftsblick"). Indeed, though on one occasion Risach is shown to be a little uncertain of his physiognomical sensation – he does not know why he was frightened by Mathilde's mother's face ("Ich erschrak ein wenig, wußte aber nicht warum" 587) – other instances, such as when he interprets Mathilde's blushes (605) or her eyes and angelic being (609), or when he speculates on the physical expression of her parents' disapproval (616), confirm his regard for and faith in the knowledge of faces (cf. Tytler 291-92). In addition to Risach's apparent foreknowledge of Heinrich's success, Heinrich's father claims that the old woman who lived next door to the Drendorfs in the city prophesied that Heinrich would amount to a great deal (666). This subtle tension about Heinrich's appearance and the prediction of his fortune implies one of two things in regard to the physiognomical evaluation of the character and status of the novel's hero. Either the members of Heinrich's family do not possess the skills necessary to read faces accurately and so cannot see in him what Risach and the old woman neighbor apparently see. Or his family is right and Heinrich emanates no sense of purpose or self-determination. Either way, knowledge of Heinrich's purpose seems to be the product of his father's assertion of the unexplained insight of an old woman who is otherwise not mentioned in the novel or – most significantly – of the planned foresight of a central figure in the novel, the enthusiastic cultural connoisseur and still influential former statesman Risach. Again, Stifter underlays the relation of Heinrich and physiognomic knowledge with curious twists of doubt that query the means and credibility of Heinrich's eventual successful attainment of *Bildung*. First, the fact that Heinrich lacks a great physiognomy is an indication – by the rules of physiognomical discourse – that he would himself not make a great physiognomist (cf. Lavater 107-08; cf. Rivers, "'L'homme hiéroglyphié'" 154-55). And second, since neither Heinrich's parents nor Risach and the old woman neighbor attach any particular facial features to their respective meaning-less and meaning-full observations of Heinrich, this newcomer on the intellectual and cultural scene forever remains *a blank page waiting to be written*.

Thus while the first-person narrative of the male protagonist of Stifter's text emphasizes a successful ascent to *Bildung* by means of acquiring physiognomical sensation, that entire text subtly weaves in an ironic distance to the two ideals of *Bildung* and physiognomy in a way that makes of Heinrich Drendorf something of an anomaly among the intellectual heroes of his era. In his 1993 lectures on the *Representations of the Intellectual* – in which "representations" connotes the "articulations of a cause or idea to society" (20) – Edward Said refers to the unruly, life-altering, and reality-shattering young male heroes of novels by Ivan Sergeevich Turgenev, Gustave Flaubert, and James Joyce as he defines the role and purpose of intellectuals. For Said,

> the intellectual is an individual endowed with a faculty for representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to, as well as for, a public. And this role has an edge to it, and cannot be played without a sense of being someone whose place it is publicly to raise embarrassing questions, to confront orthodoxy and dogma (rather than to produce them), to be someone who cannot easily be co-opted by governments or corporations, and whose *raison d'être* is to represent all those people and issues that are routinely forgotten or swept under the rug. (11)

The intellectual is someone who is consistent and rigorous with speaking the truth (12), who leads "a quite peculiar, even abrasive style of life and social performance that is uniquely theirs" (14), and "whose whole being is staked on a critical sense, a sense of being unwilling to accept easy formulas, or ready-made clichés, or the smooth, ever-so-accommodating confirmations of what the powerful or conventional have to say, and what they do" (23). Said's selection gives the impression that this definition of "obstinate young men" (17) – which he discusses as a model for the academic and nonacademic intellectuals of the contemporary age of media and technology – is typical of the hero of the nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century Bildungsroman. But this is far from the case with the character of Heinrich Drendorf in Stifter's *Der Nachsommer*. Here – regardless of the fact that Heinrich initially stubbornly disagrees with his rural host on the chances of rain (an argument he loses) and that he in one way improves on Risach's lot by succeeding to marry the woman of his desires (a woman whose acquaintance he makes through Risach) – reality is not greatly altered by Heinrich's arrival. Rather, things profoundly stay the same as the hero narrates his unconditional acquiescence to the lessons of his traditionalist mentor. Stifter's work serves as an example that runs contrary to those novels optimistically cited by Said. It depicts a young man who does not challenge, but is loyal to the dominant class, who does not upset, but fortifies the status quo, and who does not reject, but pursues social station (cf. Said esp. 32 and 20).[49] Heinrich soon abandons his initial, almost adversarial attitude toward Risach – as briefly evidenced in their first encounter – in order to observe and adopt the ways of this authority. Curiously, Dieter Borchmeyer writes that "insubordination to social institutions and to the obligation to conform belongs to the being of the artist as revealed in Risach" ("Ideologie der Familie" 245). More on the right track, Jürgen Jacobs remarks that Heinrich's conflict- and problem-free development is unusual for the Bildungsroman tradition (189-90; see also Jacobs/Krause 160, 165; Buggert 165, esp. n51-54). Certainly the treatment of Heinrich strikes a different chord from that of the protagonists of other novels of formation. Otto Friedrich Bollnow contrasts the education of the young man in the university of life as exemplified by Goethe's Wilhelm and Stifter's depiction of Heinrich's education by means of the appropriation of a given set of material (30). Bollnow correctly points out that the role of art in *Bildung* in Stifter no longer concerns production as in Goethe, but merely the transmission of a given understanding of art (30; see also Berman, "Authority" esp. 119; and G. Mayer 120). Russell A. Berman asserts that "In Stifter's frozen world, the sole meaning of various semiotic systems – clothes and weather in addition to mountains and books – is the exigency of subordination and the command to submit" ("Authority" 122). To Berman's list of systems, it is necessary to add physiognomy and the interpretation of the body. Heinrich's dabbling in art and – especially – his practice of physiognomy are thus not so much about a genial young man making his unique mark in the world. Rather, these knowledgeable pursuits once repeated by the acquiescent pupil ultimately confirm the status of *his* teachers (cf. Blasberg 342).

While Mathilde, Eustach, Heinrich's father, and – especially – the Princess (382-83) all contribute in some way to Heinrich's instruction, it is Risach whose mentoring proves to have the most influence on Heinrich. Risach acts as a cultural and pedagogical steward and avuncular example for Heinrich and other young men and boys within his sphere. He is an "adviser and fatherly friend" (277) to Heinrich, and they interact like father and son (394). His first job was as Alfred's "tutor" (585) and later he takes on the role of guardian, tutor, and model for Gustav (630, 114, 220). The notion of being an example to one's junior is repeated in the relationship between Heinrich and Gustav in which the young boy becomes devotedly attached to the young man (220, 235, 298, 317, 352).

---

[49] A more independent example of a young artist is struck by the figure of Roland. He is in his twenties, and is described as "schön gewachsen" and as having "braune Wangen und dunkle Locken und ein klein wenig aufgeworfene Lippen" (184). He has a fiery, determined, and passionate nature and strikes a contrast to the example of strength in resolution, peace, and discipline set by Risach, Eustach, and Gustav, since the successful impression he makes relies more on brute force (216, 254). Walter-Schneider maintians that Roland's physiognomy reflects a creative disposition that differentiates him from the *Nachsommer* society ("Das Licht" 398-99). See also Berman ("Authority" 107); Gillespie (320); Lange (71); Lindau (77); Ragg-Kirkby (329-31); Wildbolz (104-05).

Stifter takes his cue for the dynamic of paternal tutor and filial pupil in his version of modern education from the pedagogical institutions of the ancient Greeks and Romans. Risach accounts for the extent and passage of the intellectual and historical achievement of the Greeks and – particularly – Romans with their assiduous attention to the care and development of the body (297-98) and, thus, promotes the part played by physical exercise in the education of his young charges. The development of Alfred's mind is intricately linked with the health and strength of his body (596, 601). And whereas Gustav is strong, Risach contends he still needs toughening up (660-61). Similarly, Heinrich undertakes a regimen of physical exercise on "the advice of experienced men" (19) and, later, on his walks, the improvement of the body and mind again merge as he takes with him the works of classical writers and scholars Homer, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Thucydides (270-71; see also 443, 557). Furthermore, the references to Gustav's girllike qualities suggest that he resembles the androgynous boy pupil of the adult citizen in the formative structure of ancient Greece.[50] This paradigm, which saw older men serve as mentors to youths, is also recalled by the youthful and full-bearded male faces on the classical cameos,[51] and is reconfirmed in Heinrich's physiognomical observation of Gustav and Risach walking side by side. Heinrich regards the two as the alpha and omega of the same trajectory. Whereas Gustav's stride is "lighter" and compared with "a cheerful spring day," and his figure is "slim" and like "the happy beginning," Risach's way of walking is "still powerful, but decisive and measured," his figure is "the inclination toward the end" (113-14). By invoking classical times in the context of the education of young men in the modern age, and by discussing the relation between youth and maturity (esp. 275-76, 374), Stifter's novel utilizes the same cultural mechanism informing the purpose of much of Winckelmann's enthusiasm for classical art recorded almost a century earlier.

---

[50] "es war so einfach, daß es gleichsam keinen Wunsch, keine Sorge, kein Leiden, keine Bewegung aussprach, und doch war es wieder so weich und gütig, daß man wenn der feurige Blick nicht gewesen wäre, in das Angesicht eines Mädchens zu blicken geglaubt haben würde" (376); "'Er ist ein vollkommener Jüngling geworden ... Er war ein sehr kraftvoller Knabe, und ist auch ein solcher Jüngling geworden, aber, wie ich glaube, gemilderter, und sanfter. Ja in seinen Augen, die noch glänzender geworden sind, erscheint mir etwas, das beinahe wie das Schmachten bei einem Mädchen ist'" (660). Oertel Sjögren points out the influence of Wilhelm von Humboldt's conception of the ideal sexually undifferentiated human form ("Ein Musterbeispiel" 113; Oertel 179).

In her "Introduction" to *Outing Goethe and His Age*, Alice A. Kuzniar refers to psychoanalyst Kaja Silverman's "'Greek' model" – the second of "three Freudian paradigms of male homosexuality that reconfigure the Oedipal triangle" (Kuzniar, "Introduction" 12) – in order to facilitate an understanding of the historical self-determination of Enlightenment writers. Kuzniar explains that this model of male same-sex attraction is based on the idea that, unlike other passive objects of desire in ancient Greek society such as women, slaves, and foreigners, the male youth would ultimately mature into an adult citizen and thus change roles to become the active desiring subject. Key to the structure of this man-boy love – and to its relevance to a discussion of Winckelmann's aesthetics or, for that matter, of Stifter's depiction of *Bildung* – is the antithetical duality of the adult male's attraction for the male youth, since this duality reveals the extent of the adult's self-interest that lies at the heart of his attraction. The mature male citizen is drawn at once to the idea of his own previous passivity (or femininity) now embodied by the youth and to the anticipatory impression of his current activity (or masculinity) reflected in the younger male's sex/penis. Kuzniar remarks that the "'Greek' model" is most useful not as a means of defining Winckelmann's sexual orientation, but as a formula for deciphering his intentions in selecting and idealizing classical works of art ("Introduction" 13) – a custom that resurfaces with Stifter's Risach and again with his Heinrich. Kuzniar proposes that the significance of the model lies in "how the ontogenetic age gap between the boy and the adult male can be inscribed onto the phylogenetic spread between the ancients and the moderns" ("Introduction" 13). That is, the tension and torsion of the generation gap in the evolution of individuals can be transferred to describe the meaning of the evolutionary relation between Winckelmann and his German contemporaries – or Stifter's Risach and nineteenth-century Austria[52] – and the people of the classical civilizations that engendered the art objects they admire. Kuzniar concludes that "not only does Winckelmann fall in love with the youth encrypted in the Greek statues ... but he also positions his own era and its aesthetics in terms of this earlier period. Through his revival of the past, Winckelmann offered his contemporaries an image of what they presently were – in other words, of the vibrancy of their own aesthetic discourse on beauty and grace, suffering and sublimity" ("Introduction" 13).

---

[51] "Auf den andern Steinen befanden sich Männer in Helmen, entweder schöne junge Angesichter oder alte mit ehrwürdigen Bärten. Solche, die in mittleren Mannesjahren standen, waren gar nicht vorhanden" (368).

In *Der Nachsommer*, Heinrich's observation of and both passive and active part in the formative relation between generations, and the attention given to his physiognomical sensation and aesthetic sensitivity, invite an examination of the relation between the current cultural establishment and the classical standards to which it so frequently alludes. Just as it is possible for Kuzniar to read Winckelmann's love of classical art objects as ultimately promoting the cultural standing of his time by connecting that time with a cultural manifestation of the past (since the recognition of that previous manifestation as a standard anticipates the high value of the later art discourse), so is it also possible now to see in Heinrich's physiognomical attraction to Gustav, Natalie, and Mathilde and in his pedagogical relationship with Risach a mechanism that props up the structure of the field of culture in his own time. Again, the duality of the Greek model provides a ready formula for analyzing the motivation behind the idealization of classical works and classical looks – this time – in the novel. Christine Oertel remarks how "The relationship between tutor and student is fashioned in *Der Nachsommer* after the Greek concept of Eros. Mathilde brings her son Gustav to

---

[52] Risach maintains that those nation states that develop and acquire the knowledge of reason and education will reap the rewards in riches, power, and splendor ("Die Staaten, die durch Entwicklung des Verstandes und durch Bildung sich dieses Wissen zuerst erwerben, werden an Reichtum, an Macht und Glanz vorausschreiten" 425).

Risach, because the boy needs a masculine teacher who will love him" (176; cf. Schuller 43). The implications of the generation gap between the adult and youth – that the youth is the image of the adult's former being and the anticipation or promise of his present maturity, and which is explicitly alluded to in the novel – can be read into the relation between modern society and classical civilization. Following Risach's lead, Heinrich becomes enamored first with the works of antiquity, then with Gustav as he reflects the subjects of those works, and finally with Natalie and Mathilde as they too resemble the figures of antiquity. But Heinrich does not only fall in love with the beauty of those classical cameos and statues or of their likenesses in the faces of the Maklodens / Taronas, he also at the same time situates the intellectual and aesthetic potential of his own times in relation to the achievements of the classical past. His narration of his appreciation of antiquity provides his contemporaries with an example or representation of their current cultural maturity.

However, Stifter's use not just of art but also of physiognomy has enabled his fiction to go a step further, to take that step to which Winckelmann hoped to inspire his contemporaries. In Stifter, objects from the past do not so much anticipate later manifestations than they become imitated or realized in them (see also Borchmeyer, "restaurative Utopie?" 76-79). Antiques are painstakingly restored or copied and made anew. Antiquity is not only appreciated and discussed, it is quite literally transposed onto a selection of faces in the (fictional) present. This actualization of classical physiques insinuates that the cultural maturity of the present lies not in its art talk, but in the look and nature of a certain segment of people. In this way, by learning a love of classical beauty (mainly from Risach's and his father's thoughts and things) and by projecting the dimensions of that past onto the faces of his influential friends, Heinrich does not merely signal the elevation of his times, he attempts to *restore* the standard of earlier culture in the present scene. Stifter's Bildungsroman, then, portrays a hero whose cultural coming of age is integral to the privilege of a particular family (or class). Heinrich's endeavor to cultivate himself by means of art and – especially – physiognomy is less a challenge to the existing structures of cultural authority – as is the case with the 'obstinate young men' of other seminal novels in the nineteenth century – and more a phenomenon to be co-opted by the members of the 'establishment' in their bid to guarantee the critical criteria for the preservation of their continued hold on symbolic power. The treatment of faces – the objects of physiognomy – thus very much parallels the improvement and restoration of cultural objects of art that Franziska Schößler reads as patriarchal strategies of ordering (esp. 8, 42, 50).[53]

Stifter's novel makes abundant references to physiognomy in a way that recalls Lavater's *Fragments* and their modification of the discourse to a dependence on relations external to the sign. An identity-function – be that contemporary modern or timeless classical – informs the elements of the face that, when arranged with all others, are used to explain and rank the nature of the individual. *Der Nachsommer* also shows how physiognomical sensation is an integral part of *Bildung*. Yet it treats both *Bildung* and physiognomy ironically by showing neither to reach completion. In both instances, the need to know is secondary to the need to assert knowledge in order to assert oneself. Physiognomy is a tactic operated particularly by Heinrich under Risach's auspices. It recognizes the 'rightful' superiority of some and the relative lesser sociocultural stations of others. It is a discourse assigned with the task of sustaining that nature that is free of the – according to Risach – "working-class" traits of "self-contentedness and carelessness" and that is conducive to success as the stuff of "artists, poets, scholars, statesmen, and generals" (81). Likewise, *Bildung* is a tactic that guarantees the supply of ambitious young men willing to reiterate knowledge-systems that recognize others' dominant authority in return for their own legitimation in the field of culture. As social and cultural critic Pierre Bourdieu maintains in his work *The Field of Cultural Production*, "institutions (such as the education system) ... ensure the reproduction of agents imbued with the categories ... specific to the 'cultivated disposition'" (121). Certainly, Eustach and Heinrich's consideration of their privileged place at the dining table at the Asperhof is a succinct illustration of the aspiring artist's or intellectual's readiness to believe in his legitimate elevation and of the understanding that such an association with bourgeois economic and political forces is permanent while for others it is not: "Eustach felt that he was included in higher society, something which I found quite natural ever since I had got to know him better, whereas the others did not notice that they were being elevated."[54] Indeed, the relations between an intellectual and other intellectuals, their interests, their creations or scholarship, or economic and cultural institutions depends on the amount and distribution of recognition in their field of cultural production as well as on the relative recognition of that field in the overall field of culture (Bourdieu, esp. 30, 131, 132). And each newcomer causes a shift in the power relations constituting the quantity and distribution of recognition (Bourdieu 32). In Heinrich's case, though the protagonist makes inroads into country society and foists himself on several kinds of cultural producers as well as on statesmen, significant members of high society, the military, and nobles (esp. 290-91), his arrival hardly displaces relations in the field of culture. He is not a Bazarov, a Moreau, or a Dedalus. Rather, he appeals to and becomes a projection of Risach's insipidly oppressive reinforcement of the restrictive conservative tradition that distinguishes only those professional intellectuals who conduct their inquiries in the service of the bourgeois class.[55] Heinrich's independent intellectual predisposition for natural history is compromised and diverted in favor of his less accomplished aesthetic (cf. Borchmeyer, "restaurative Utopie?" 80; cf. Schmitt 285) and physiognomical abilities that nonetheless provide him a role and earn him recognition.

---

[53] Jacobs remarks on the "unquestioned patriarchy" of the *Nachsommer*-world (192). See also Wagner for a sociohistorical account of the structures of patriarchal authority (esp. 144, 156, and 160ff.) and Manthey for an analysis of paternal authority in Stifter's novel from a psychoanalytical perspective (261ff).

Physiognomical sensation thus aids and abets one's insertion into the realm of cultured people. Heinrich's own *facelessness* is thus particularly appropriate, not because the story of his journey is told from his perspective, but because, in order to succeed, he must be malleable enough for the establishment to make of him what it will (cf. Jacobs/Krause 169-70). As Said contends, "The hardest aspect of being an intellectual is to represent what you profess through your work and interventions, without hardening into an institution or a kind of automaton acting at the behest of a system or method" and that "as an intellectual you are the one who can choose between actively representing the truth to the best of your ability and passively allowing a patron or an authority to direct you" (121). Heinrich clearly chooses not to challenge authority, but to embrace Risach as his "symbolic banker" providing the "symbolic capital" needed to bring Heinrich into the consecrated circle of intellectuals and of "reciprocal recognition" (see Bourdieu 77 & 116; cf. Blasberg 342). To say the same of Stifter, that with his *Nachsommer* he takes the position of a cultural conservative, would be to ignore his inclusion of ironic elements in the novel that query Heinrich's achievement and indicate that the hero's struggle to enter the intellectual realm is one less inclined to pit him against the cultural authorities that be, than it is concerned with the speed and acuity of his ability to grasp the delimited components of a cultural education. It would also be tantamount to conflating the author too readily with his characters (cf. Oertel 219; cf. Tismar 66; cf. Wagner 144). However, my examination of the discursive space of physiognomy, as a component of education and as a cultural system used by traditional intellectuals to support the hierarchies of power, is at once an analysis of the social arena in which Stifter – the student of natural sciences, the writer and artist, the private tutor and schools inspector – was himself living and working. In this context, *Der Nachsommer*, the Bildungsroman complete with ironic elements that disarm the notion of *Bildung* achieved, can be viewed as somewhat of "an effective intervention" (Said 94) on Stifter's part not only in the realm of physiognomy, but also in the social world of intellectuals, that not so self-assuredly ponders the merits of a meritocracy (cf. Stillmark 84). Heinrich's dubiously physiognomical cultural coming of age is an example proffered by Stifter of how *Bildung* – or any system of education – subordinates the intellect to the manufacture of intellectual types whose function it is to maintain the hierarchies that serve the privilege of the dominant social and political class.

---

[54] "[Eustach] empfand, daß er der höheren Gesellschaft zugezählt werde, wie ich es auch, da ich ihn näher kennen gelernt hatte, ganz natürlich fand, während die anderen nicht merkten, daß man sie empor hebe" (207).

[55] I thus disagree with Oertel Sjögren who imagines Stifter's conception of an ideal intellectual society not to be "identifiable with the titled class but accessible to members of any class" (*The Marble Statue* 75). Certainly, access is regulated and can be fully understood only in the context of class relations. For a discussion of "the intellectual" as a social category dependent on class relations, see Gramsci, "The Intellectual."

Chapter Four

The Culture of Faces: Reading Physiognomical Relations in Thomas Mann's *Der Tod in Venedig*

This chapter traces the lesson for cultural types that is implied in the relationship between the descriptions of the faces observed in Thomas Mann's *Der Tod in Venedig* (*Death in Venice*, 1912) and the behavior and cultural standing of the observers. Mann's novella, narrated in the third person, portrays Gustav von Aschenbach as a revered author and follows him on his trip to Venice. There he becomes aesthetically and passionately obsessed with a Polish lad called Tadzio before dying, presumably of Indian cholera. The story begins with the author-figure taking a break from his morning's work at home in Munich by going for a late-afternoon stroll, hoping to refresh himself and return to that work with new vigor in the evening. He enjoys fine weather and observes trees in bud, a bustling city, quiet trails, a restaurant in full swing, and an open park meadow – elements predictably conducive to reviving the creative spirit. Tired from his walk in the English Garden and suspecting the approach of a storm, Aschenbach decides to take the streetcar home from the Northern Cemetery. While waiting, he studies the Greek crosses and religious inscriptions on the Byzantine facade of the mortuary chapel: "'They are going in unto the House of the Lord,' or 'May the Light Everlasting shine upon them'" (8).[1] With nature, society, classical culture, and now also Christianity aligned about him, Aschenbach, in the late afternoon of his life, seems set for the journey back to his desk and the next burst of creativity. Yet he is distracted by the appearance of a man who stands in the portico of the chapel, facing into the sun. This figure interrupts the cohesive series of usual sights that direct the author-figure back to his cultural endeavors. First, Aschenbach assesses the man's outward appearance. Then, caught staring at the unexpected figure, he looks away. He senses a newfound desire to travel and decides to postpone his current book project by taking a holiday on the Mediterranean in order truly to put the spark back into his life and work. Indeed, that evening, instead of writing, Aschenbach will look over maps and timetables. After seeing the man in the portico, Aschenbach plots a new course.

---

[1] All references are to the 1993 Fischer edition (see "Bibliography" for details). All translations are my own.

This sudden about-face is remarkable. The journey that is to return Aschenbach to cultural production is entirely rerouted from the beaten path. And all because of a desire reawakened by encountering a man whom, after reflecting upon his appearance, Aschenbach chooses to avoid. Clearly, something in Aschenbach's appreciation of this man's outward appearance – in his reading of the stranger's physiognomy – both disturbs the author-figure and causes him to reset his ways. Yet this fellow is not the only such individual whom Aschenbach encounters and estimates during the course of the novella. As the author-figure substitutes his pedestrian break through Munich with a more venturesome holiday first in Istria and then in Venice, he is confronted with a number of male figures who seem to intrude uninvitedly into Aschenbach's world and who, for the most part, cause him discomfort. The characters whom Aschenbach encounters interrupt the smooth run of the action – whether in the overture of the opening pages or in the novella's mainstay of the trip abroad. In each case, Aschenbach reacts, sets his course again, and makes strategic decisions; and, in one instance, he is even moved to write again. He always knows how to respond. He either avoids or pursues the figures he encounters, choosing the appropriate course of action based on his physiognomical understanding of them. In the case of each individual observed, concurrent facial descriptions and character assessments pave the way for Aschenbach's response. In this way, faces in *Death in Venice* – their physiognomical reception – motivate the terms of negotiation of Aschenbach's attempt to retrieve and reinvigorate his cultural creativity.

There is no doubt that physiognomy matters in *Death in Venice*. In addition to the frequent verbs of seeing and looking, there is quite a variety of words denoting "appearance," the "face," "form," or "expression." These range from the common – "Erscheinung" (8, 9, 31, 51, 60), "Gesicht" (10, 23, 31, 33, 33, 34, 34, 42, 68, 70), "Gestalt" (20, 24, 33, 53, 53), "Antlitz" (20, 32, 54, 70), "Miene" (32, 47, 60, 60, 74), "Ausdruck" (32), "Züge" (49, 70, 71), "Angesicht" (55), and "Gesichtszüge" (80, 85) – to the more technical – "physiognomische Entstellung" (8), "physiognomische Durchbildung" (20), "Physiognomie"

(21, 28), "Gesichtsbildung" (28), "Form" (32), "Halbprofil" (33), "Profil" (36), and "Mienenspiel" (70). They are usually accompanied by descriptions that draw on further particulars – such as the shape of the nose or the color of the hair – that generally help to appraise the face in a positive or negative way. The significance of the regularity of such words and descriptions comes to the fore when the narrator explains Aschenbach's preoccupation with the human form by evoking the same theoretical and theocritical convictions underlying Johann Caspar Lavater's physiognomical project:

> Model and mirror! [Aschenbach's] eyes embraced the noble figure there at the water's edge and with ever-growing rapture he thought he was looking at beauty itself, at *form as a divine thought*, at the one and pure *perfection that resides in the spirit and here is lightly and graciously erected in a human image and likeness* for the sake of adoration ... *So too does god, in order to make visible the spirit, gladly make use of the forms and colors of human youth*, adorning it with all the splendor of beauty so that it becomes the instrument of memory, and that the very sight of it then sets us afire in pain and hope. (My emphasis.)[2]

Clearly, it is customary and appropriate in the world of this narrative to allude regularly to the physical appearance of the face as a meaningful point of reference and understanding. But the allusion to Lavater further implies that the narrative is tapping into a well-established cultural discourse that assumes the preordination of human character and colludes with existing social hierarchies.

As mentioned above, the first physiognomical portrait in Mann's novella is that of the "man in the portico, above the statues of two apocalyptic beasts that guard the steps [of the mortuary chapel], whose slightly unusual appearance sent [Aschenbach's] thoughts in an altogether different direction."[3] The narrator quickly itemizes a number of physical and sartorial features to substantiate the portico-figure's unusualness:

---

[2] "Standbild und Spiegel! Seine Augen umfaßten die edle Gestalt dort am Rande des Blauen, und in aufschwärmendem Entzücken glaubte er mit diesem Blick das Schöne selbst zu begreifen, die Form als Gottesgedanken, die eine und reine Vollkommenheit, die im Geiste lebt und von der ein menschliches Abbild und Gleichnis hier leicht und hold zur Anbetung aufgerichtet war ... So auch bediente der Gott sich, um uns das Geistige sichtbar zu machen, gern der Gestalt und Farbe menschlicher Jugend, die er zum Werkzeug der Erinnerung mit allem Abglanz der Schönheit schmückte und bei deren Anblick wir dann wohl in Schmerz und Hoffnung entbrannten" (53). Scaff sees in these words Aschenbach's evocation of Platonic thought (142).

> Moderately tall, thin, beardless, and strikingly snub-nosed, the man belonged to the red-haired type and had its milky and freckled complexion. Clearly he was not of Bavarian extraction; at any rate, the broad, straight-brimmed straw hat he wore lent his appearance the exotic impression of someone who has come from far away. It is true that he wore the customary rucksack strapped about the shoulders and a yellow belted suit of what looked like coarse woollen cloth; he carried a gray rain-cloak over his left forearm that was propped against his waist, and in his right hand a walking stick furnished with an iron point that he had stuck slantwise into the ground so he could cross his feet and lean his hip against its crook. With his head held high so that his Adam's apple stood out sturdy and bare on his lean neck growing out of an open sport-shirt, he peered sharply into the distance out of colorless, red-lashed eyes, between which two pronounced vertical furrows stood in peculiar contrast to his little turned-up nose. Thus – and perhaps his heightened and heightening location contributed to this impression – his posture projected something domineering in the way it surveyed the scene, something bold or even wild; for, whether it was because he was grimacing from being dazzled by the setting sun or because it had something to do with a permanent facial deformity, his lips seemed to be too short, they were completely pulled back from his teeth, so that the teeth, bared to the gums, showed white and long between them.[4]

---

[3] "im Portikus, oberhalb der beiden apokalyptischen Tiere, welche die Freitreppe bewachen, einen Mann bemerkte, dessen nicht ganz gewöhnliche Erscheinung seinen Gedanken eine völlig andere Richtung gab" (8).

[4] "Mäßig hochgewachsen, mager, bartlos und auffallend stumpfnäsig, gehörte der Mann zum rothaarigen Typ und besaß dessen milchige und sommersprossige Haut. Offenbar war er durchaus nicht bajuwarischen Schlages: wie denn wenigstens der breit und gerade gerandete Basthut, der ihm den Kopf bedeckte, seinem Aussehen ein Gepräge des Fremdländischen und Weitherkommenden verlieh. Freilich trug er dazu den landesüblichen Rucksack um die Schultern geschnallt, einen gelblichen Gutanzug aus Lodenstoff, wie es schien, einen grauen Wetterkragen über dem linken Unterarm, den er in die Weiche gestützt hielt, und in der Rechten einen mit eiserner Spitze versehenen Stock, welchen er schräg gegen den Boden stemmte und auf dessen Krücke er, bei gekreuzten Füßen, die Hüfte lehnte. Erhobenen Hauptes, so daß an seinem hager dem losen Sporthemd entwachsenden Halse der Adamsapfel stark und nackt hervortrat, blickte er mit farblosen, rot bewimperten Augen, zwischen denen, sonderbar genug zu seiner kurz aufgeworfenen Nase passend, zwei senkrechte, energische Furchen standen, scharf spähend ins Weite. So – und vielleicht trug sein erhöhter und

The system of Lavaterian physiognomy – alluded to at several points in the novella – proposes that it is possible to decode an individual's character or nature from the structure of the face. Accordingly, the nature of the 'slightly unusual-looking' man in the portico must be known since he possesses a particular set of features that allow the observer to classify him in the overall scheme of the characters in the novella. Yet, in Lavater's project, the individual is not known simply by measuring the physical dimensions of the face. Rather, external features become meaningful reference points for determining human nature and knowing a person's worth only because, as a whole, they are subordinated to abstract social relations. That is, the various constituent elements of the face and body derive meaning from a prior understanding of that individual's identity in relation to that part of society to which the observer belongs. Broad preconceptions of a person's role – the social, ethnocultural, class, gender, or generational function of their identity from the observer's perspective – are read as transparent with the structure of the face and enable it to be located in the order of humanity that supplies the knowledge of that person's nature. In the case of the unusual-looking man in the portico, the elements of his appearance – his beardlessness, snub nose, red hair, fair complexion, exotic hat, pale eyes, long teeth – are generally those of someone who is, to Aschenbach, recognizably 'from far away' and thus *an itinerant* and *non-Bavarian*. In the very first sentence of the novel the narrator mentions the "threatening appearance" ("gefahrdrohende Miene" 7) of the political climate in Europe, a direct allusion to the 1911 Agadir Incident between Germany and France. This passing remark is sufficient to provide the social function of the unusual figure's identity as an *itinerant foreigner* (see also Fickert 27; J. Frey 179). From the perspective of Aschenbach's culture, a foreigner is regarded as someone who *poses a danger or threat to national or personal interests*. This identity-function necessarily predicates the facial and bodily features of the man in the portico, which in turn supply the substance of his nature. Sure enough, the concept of *danger* is readily fused with the unusual appearance of the man in the portico. He is cast between

---

erhöhender Standort zu diesem Eindruck bei – hatte seine Haltung etwas herrisch Überschauendes, Kühnes oder selbst Wildes; denn sei es, daß er, geblendet, gegen die untergehende Sonne grimassierte oder daß es sich um eine dauernde physiognomische Entstellung handelte: seine Lippen schienen zu kurz, sie waren völlig von den Zähnen zurückgezogen, dergestalt, daß diese, bis zum Zahnfleisch bloßgelegt, weiß und lang dazwischen hervorbleckten" (8-9).

'apocalyptic beasts.' Like a jellyfish, he is at once red, speckled, and translucent. Like some predator, he is armed with an iron point that stabs the ground and with fang-like teeth bared by retracted lips. His hat, stick, and position upon a threshold are reminiscent of Hermes the summoner of souls. Erich Heller believes that the figure resembles "a Dürer's image of Death" (104). The danger in confronting the man in the portico becomes all too apparent when he returns Aschenbach's glances in a manner that significantly is "so warlike, so straight in the eye, so clearly intent on making an issue out of the matter and forcing the other to withdraw his gaze."[5] By reading the features of the man in the portico as agreeing with an identity-function, Aschenbach will suppose to know him: the man bears the sign of the unusual and exotic appearance and is thus seen to be 'domineering,' 'bold,' 'wild' – that is, aggressive and threatening by nature.

The man in the portico is not the only 'unusual' person whom Aschenbach observes. On his way to and while vacationing in Venice, the author-figure encounters a series of passing characters whose appearances, through a variety of reoccurring outward features and gestures, are analogous both with this first figure and with each other. These further peripheral figures include the old sailor, the man with a goatee, the old dandy clerk, the gondolier, the hotel manager, the elevator boy, the hotel barber, a beggar, an antiques dealer, the buffo-baritone guitarist, and the travel agent. Dorrit Cohn believes these figures are meaningful "by way of their serial *re*appearances" (136) and several critics see them as interchangeable.[6] The straw hat worn by the unusual man in the portico is reflected in the hat worn by the man with the goatee "tilted across his forehead" (21), in the old dandy's "tilted Panama hat" (23), in the gondolier's "shapeless straw hat ... tilted rakishly on his head" (28), in the hat the beggar extends (65), and in the baritone guitarist's "shabby felt hat on the back of his head" (70). The man in the portico, the gondolier, and the baritone guitarist all have the same "snub nose," the same "retracted lips" baring "white teeth," and the same "red hair" and "red eyebrows" (8-6, 28, 70-71). The baritone guitarist also has the same "pale," "beardless" face, the same "protruding Adam's apple" on the same "lean neck" sticking out of the same "sport-shirt," the same two "pronounced furrows," and even "grimaces" just like the man in the portico (70-71). Also, the man in the portico and the old dandy both wear a "yellow-colored suit" (8, 22) – to which the dandy adds a "red tie" (22) – made out of a "woolen" material similar to the fabric of the travel agent's clothes (74), while further parallels are established through the persistent color of the gondolier's "yellow sash" (28), of the "yellow fingers" of the man with the goatee (22), and of the old dandy's "yellow false set of teeth" (23, 26). Final links with the man in the portico include the repetition of his colorless eyes in "the whites" of the beggar's eyes (65) and the reflection of his red hair in the travel agent's blushes (74), while the old dandy and the baritone guitarist are further associated with each other by their use of makeup (23, 68) and by the former's phoney youthful looks (23) and the latter's indeterminate age (70). Apparent connections between the various peripheral figures also form around the tendency to "smirk" or "grin" (21, 48, 70, 71, 72), to "bow theatrically" (22), "bow and scrape" (26, 71, 72), "grovel" (65, 71; "katzbuckelnd," literally meaning "arching like a cat"), or otherwise to be "squatting" (65), permanently "hunched" (21), or have "difficulty with one's equilibrium" (25), to look "unclean" (21) or "shabby" (70) and smell (71), to have a cigarette butt dangling from "the corner of the mouth" (21) or "between the fingers" (25), to "lick the corner of the mouth with the tip of the tongue" (25, 26, 70) or simply to stick one's tongue out (74), to have "boney" (22), "old" (23), and "wrinkled" (25) fingers that paw (25) or point at others (73), to have some kind of decorative half-beard such as a "goatee" (21), a "mustache" (23, 28, 30) – whether genuine or false (23) – or an "imperial" (23, 26), to have a "slight build" paradoxically accompanied by "great energy" (28) or "inflated exertion" (70), or, finally, to "chatter" (22, 62, 81), "stammer and giggle" (25), make "gurgling, hollow, and encumbered" noises (26-27), "talk between the teeth" (29), or be shrill (23) or laugh uproariously (72).

---

[5] "so kriegerisch, so gerade ins Auge hinein, so offenkundig gesonnen, die Sache aufs Äußerste zu treiben und den Blick des andern zum Abzug zu zwingen" (9).

[6] See also Amory (405); Cadieux (60); Deuse (48-49); von Gronicka (197-99); Heilbut (253, 256); Kohut (144, 145, 148, 152-53); Martini (190); Mautner (20); Nicklas (63-65); Reed (*Text* 154; *Making and Unmaking* 43-44, 62-63); Rockwood/Rockwood (138, 140); Sommerhage (73); Swales (*Thomas Mann* 38); Tobin ("Life and Works" 230); and Venable (27).

Just as the structure of the external appearance of the man in the portico lends itself to the decoding of his nature, so does the same set of features in the ensuing sequence of peripheral figures serve the purpose of indicating a series of men with similar natures. This is possible not simply because the features of the peripheral figures are the same as those of the man in the portico, but because, like those of the man in the portico, the dimensions of the features of this unusual lineup are regarded as a measure of the perceived social function of the figures' respective identities. Yet, since these characters' appearances – their tilted hats, their snub noses, their red hair, their pale, beardless or only half-bearded faces, their slight builds, etc. – are much the same as those of the man in the portico, it stands to reason that their identities will have something in common with his. The old sailor, the man with the goatee, and the old dandy clerk are ethnic Italians from Austrian-administered Istria; and the dandy clerk prattles in French. The gondolier, so the text claims, is "absolutely not of Italian extraction" (28). The hotel manager wears French-styled clothes. The elevator boy is a French-speaking Swiss. The hotel barber becomes Aschenbach's German conversation partner since particularly the Germans are leaving the resort. The baritone guitarist, so the text again insists, is "not of Venetian extraction" and more likely Neapolitan (70). Finally, the travel agent is British. Thus, like the man in the portico, the peripheral figures are all foreign nationals to Aschenbach and, since they are all implicated in travel and in some way foreign to their current and immediate environment, they can at that be considered *itinerant foreigners*.

As we know from the discussion of the man in the portico in the context of Lavaterian physiognomy, it is the qualitative affect of the function of his identity – from Aschenbach's cultural perspective – as an *itinerant foreigner*, that is, to pose a danger or threat, that substantiates the unusual man's appearance that supposedly reveals his nature. In the exact same way, the dangers associated with foreignness and itinerance also determine the physiognomical dimensions of the other unusual figures that affirm their natures. The international crisis in Agadir, evoked subtly at the very onset of the novel and instrumental in establishing the threatening function of the first foreigner encountered in the cemetery, is once again especially defining in regard to the character of the threat posed by the peripheral aliens. This incident, in addition to appearing aggressive, was all about deception. On July 1, 1911, the Germans sent the gunboat Panther to the Moroccan port of Agadir ostensibly to protect German nationals and commercial interests there during a local disturbance. However, the real intention was to counteract what Germany regarded as French colonial expansionism in Morocco. Essentially, Germany was playing a game of military bluff in order to force a renegotiation of an earlier convention on Morocco in which German interests in northwest Africa had remained largely unsatisfied, which was also the case after the second incident. A similar atmosphere of compulsive deception has also taken hold of affairs in Aschenbach's foreign destination of Venice. For instance, after Aschenbach encounters the antiques dealer who "invited the passer-by to stop in the hope of deceiving him," the narrator remarks that this is the beauty of Venice, "flattering and suspect ... partly a trap for foreigners," and that "Aschenbach recalls also that the city is ill and hides this fact for love of profit."[7]

For sure, the apparent hostility and trickery that comprise the presumed dangerous function of itinerant foreigners are factored into the dimensions of the appearances of the peripheral figures. The method used goes back to Polemo and today is called "diminution" (see also Diller, esp. 229). The itinerant foreigners are hunchbacked and showy caprine, feline, or anuran ("buffo" coming from "bufo" meaning toad, 68) creatures that blabber and bleat or caw and make the mocking noises of a bird ("Pechvogel," literally meaning "bird of misfortune," 73).[8] They are physically crooked and off-balance with pointing digits and jerky expressions and movements. They smolder, glow red, and give off foul odors. They are pieced together artificially, made over, and dyed. They are more at home in the circus (21), on the comical stage (22, 68, 70), or among the ranks and in the dens of criminals, swindlers, and pimps (29, 65, 70). Especially the old sailor, the man with the goatee, and the gondolier are Charonic. By such measures, the old dandy clerk is seen to be "bold," "lighthearted" (23), "teasing" (23, 25), "wretchedly high-spirited" (25), "importunate," and "dreadful" (26). Similarly, the gondolier is viewed as "churlish and brutal," "rakish" (28), "peculiarly insubordinate and uncannily resolute," "high-handed" (29), and "bad" (30), while the hotel manager is "flatteringly polite" (30). Likewise, the baritone guitarist is regarded as "cheeky," "insistent," "brutal and rakish, dangerous and entertaining," "ambiguous," "offensive," "defiant, overbearing, and almost wild" (70), "suspect," "maliciously obsequious," "threatening" (71), "boisterous," and "mocking" (72). Indeed, by reading the peripheral figures' appearances as animalistic, asymmetric, excessive, phoney, and melodramatic or unlawful, that is, concurring their identity-function as foreign itinerants, Aschenbach knows them all to be 'threatening' and 'suspicious' by nature.[9]

---

[7] "ein Altertumshändler ... lud den Vorüberziehenden ... zum Aufenthalt ein, in der Hoffnung, ihn zu betrügen;" "Das war Venedig, die schmeichlerische und verdächtige Schöne, – diese Stadt ... halb Fremdenfalle ... [Aschenbach] erinnerte sich auch, daß die Stadt krank sei und es aus Gewinnsucht verheimliche" (65).

[8] Weiner discusses the dangerous acoustical impressions of the negative figures (esp. 142-45, 147). The acoustical inferiority of their 'noise' signals their social inferiority and thus the threat they pose to an author of high social standing (Weiner 137-39, 150-51).

The physiognomies that go to serve the assumed respective natures of the men Aschenbach observes thus also make the protagonist's reactions self-explanatory. Aschenbach has distinct and consistent reactions to the various negative types he observes and defines. For example, he initially undertakes a "half-absentminded, half-inquisitive examination" of the man in the portico, but when the protagonist realizes that the unusual and threatening figure is returning his glances, he feels "embarrassment ... turns away ... [decides] not to pay the man any more attention ... and looks at the ground" (9). After daydreaming (9-10), he "wipes his face" and walks on "shaking his head" (10), but later checks for the man – who has since disappeared – in spite of deciding earlier not to do so (13). Similarly, Aschenbach shudders (23) and his brow darkens (25) at the sight of the deceptive dandy clerk, he "covers his brow with his hands and closes his eyes" (23), has hallucinations of the figure in his sleep (24), feels numb (25), and later tries to evade the man's drunken farewells (26). Aschenbach turns to face the gondolier only when he is obliged to address him (28). Otherwise he feels as if in a trance and keeps his back to the unlawful character (29). This figure also disappears as Aschenbach discovers when he returns to pay him after changing some money (30). The author-figure is so unsettled by the encounters with the old dandy and with the gondolier that as soon as he is left alone in his hotel room he "washes his face" (31). The overbearing baritone guitarist causes Aschenbach to put on "a fixed and painful smile," to sit up "straight as if trying to put up some resistance or readying himself to flee,"[10] and, in part, again to feel as if caught in a spell (73). When the author-figure approaches the travel agent, he does so with "the look of a distrustful foreigner" (74), and, after receiving the man's news, has "a dreadful nightmare" (78ff.). In sum, Aschenbach is disturbed or disgusted by the object of his gaze, makes little or no effort to hide this, and yet tries to avoid the other's attentions by averting his own glances.

---

[9] Even the British travel agent is not to be entirely trusted. On the one hand, the Briton seems to show Aschenbach a kinder face as a foreigner: "still young, with his hair parted in the middle, close-set eyes, and that manner of sober loyalty that seems so alien and so extraordinary in the roguish and quick-witted South" ("noch jung, mit in der Mitte geteiltem Haar, nahe bei einander liegenden Augen und von jener gesetzten Loyalität des Wesens, die im spitzbübisch behenden Süden so fremd, so merkwürdig anmutet" 74). He abandons the official silence concerning the cholera outbreak and provides Aschenbach with an honest answer to his questions. On the other hand, the implication of the discovery of a traditional ally in the fellow northern European amounts, in the context of the Agadir Incident, to a historical and practical miscalculation on Aschenbach's part. In the diplomacy that followed Agadir, the British did not support the German position. Indeed, the British travel agent has "blue eyes" (74) that in idiomatic German declare him to be *blauäugig* or naive.

By considering his reactions, it is possible to see that Aschenbach first takes a position in the world of this novella in direct opposition to those he defines as unusual, foreign, and threatening. His *undisguised disapproval* and the fact that he cleanses himself after contact or shuts himself off signal a clear distance between himself and threatening itinerant foreigners that prevents the knowledge of their appearances from reflecting on him in any way. This is an important point since – like the gunboat Panther off the Moroccan coast – Aschenbach in his Venetian setting is also itinerant and foreign. But, apparently, he is not one of them, and a man in his position should not consort with them nor consider the threat they pose one he can confront, although, as the dreams and tiger(/panther?)-imagery testify, that sense of danger triggered by encountering strangers also stirs in his own subconscious. Thus, the first basic component of the physiognomical negotiation of the author-figure's cultural standing is establishing the necessary physical evidence that enables him to locate and avoid the unusual and the dangerous.

Not all the figures encountered by Aschenbach are shown to be so negative in character. For example, the protagonist's first observation of Tadzio – the figure also at the center of the Lavater-like reflection on the divine use of the human form – paints a picture that, compared to the peripheral figures, leaves an almost entirely favorable impression of the Polish lad. The initial description of the "long-haired boy of perhaps fourteen years" (32) is once again typical of physiognomical procedures in that it begins with an itemization and gradually becomes more creative:

---

[10] "einem fix gewordenen und schon schmerzenden Lächeln" (69); "aufgerichtet wie zum Versuche der Abwehr oder der Flucht" (73).

> Aschenbach noticed with astonishment that the boy was a perfect beauty. His countenance, pale and gracefully reserved, surrounded by honey-colored ringlets of hair, with its straight nose, its lovely mouth, and its expression of gracious and divine gravity, recalled Greek sculpture of the noblest period. Yet despite the purest perfection of form, it was of such unique personal charm that the observer thought he had never encountered, in nature or in art, anything quite so successful ... Softness and tenderness evidently determined the boy's existence. No one had dared to put scissors to his beautiful hair. Like that of the slave boy extracting a thorn, it curled about his brow, over his ears, and still lower over the nape of his neck. An English sailor's suit, with baggy sleeves that narrowed to form a tight fit around the delicate wrists of his still childish yet slender hands, along with its braids, stitching, and embroidery, lent his tender figure a certain rich and spoilt air. He sat in half profile to the observer, his feet – one before the other – in black patent leather shoes, one elbow leaning on the arm of a basket-chair, his cheek nestled against the closed hand, in a pose of casual grace and quite unlike the almost subservient stiffness to which his sisters appeared to have adapted themselves. Was he poorly? For his ivory-white complexion contrasted the golden darkness of the surrounding curls. Or was he simply a pampered favorite, supported by a partial and capricious love?[11]

---

[11] "Mit Erstaunen bemerkte Aschenbach, daß der Knabe vollkommen schön war. Sein Antlitz, – bleich und anmutig verschlossen, von honigfarbenem Haar umringelt, mit der gerade abfallenden Nase, dem lieblichen Munde, dem Ausdruck von holdem und göttlichem Ernst, erinnerte an griechische Bildwerke aus edelster Zeit, und bei reinster Vollendung der Form war es von so einmalig-persönlichem Reiz, daß der Schauende weder in Natur noch bildender Kunst etwas ähnlich Geglücktes angetroffen zu haben glaubte ... Weichheit und Zärtlichkeit bestimmten ersichtlich seine Existenz. Man hatte sich gehütet, die Scheere an sein schönes Haar zu legen; wie beim Dornauszieher lockte es sich in die Stirn, über die Ohren und tiefer noch in den Nacken. Ein englisches Matrosenkostüm, dessen bauschige Ärmel sich nach unten verengerten und die feinen Gelenke seiner noch kindlichen, aber schmalen Hände knapp umspannten, verlieh mit seinen Schnüren, Maschen und Stickereien der zarten Gestalt etwas Reiches und Verwöhntes. Er saß, im Halbprofil gegen den Betrachtenden, einen Fuß im schwarzen Lackschuh vor den andern gestellt, einen Ellenbogen auf die Armlehne seines Korbsessels gestützt, die Wange an die geschlossene Hand geschmiegt, in einer Haltung von lässigem Anstand und ganz ohne die fast untergeordnete Steifheit, an die seine weiblichen Geschwister gewöhnt schienen. War er leidend? Denn die Haut seines Gesichtes stach weiß wie Elfenbein gegen das goldige Dunkel der umrahmenden Locken ab. Oder war er einfach ein verzärteltes Vorzugskind, von parteilicher und launischer

Elsewhere, Tadzio is described as having "strangely twilight-gray eyes" ("seine eigentümlich dämmergrauen Augen" 34, 83; "dieser dämmergraue Blick" 87), which he is in the habit of casting down and then up again (36, 42, 45, 60); his head – "poised, like a flower in bloom, in incomparable charm" – is that "of Eros, with the yellowish luster of Parian marble" (37); his skin color is "creamy-marble," though on one day "he looks paler than usual" (60); his eyebrows are "fine and serious" (37), "symmetrical," and "sharp" (60); his curly hair grows over his temples and ears (37); he has "slender legs" (38); his smile is "indescribably lovely" (42), "eloquent, familiar, charming, and unabashed" (61), or he looks "with an expression that was hardly a smile, only a remote curiosity, a polite acceptance" (69); he strikes a pose of "innate and inevitable grace, his left forearm on the parapet, his feet crossed, his right hand on the supporting hip" (69); and yet his teeth "were not so pleasant: rather jagged and pale, without that healthy gloss and of that peculiar brittle transparency that is sometimes found among people with anemia" (42). Repeatedly, Tadzio is likened to or referred to as some figure or other from classical culture (see below). In sum, Tadzio possesses a "truly godlike beauty" (36) or "a godlike face, a perfect body" (54); he is a "beautiful boy" (38), a "charming apparition" (51, 60) and a "noble figure" (53).

As with the determination of the negative character of the peripheral figures, physiognomical custom holds that Tadzio's (positive) nature is entirely evident and ready to decode in the features of his face. Again, external appearances are seen to concur with the function of identity as it is preconceived by that part of society represented by the observer, thus enabling the individual to be classified and the knowledge of their nature to be substantiated. Tadzio enjoys a particular status in the world of mainly European holidaymakers observed by Aschenbach that necessarily predicates his face and body in a way that allows him to be known apart from the other children and characters in the novella. His white skin, blond hair, straight nose, child's hands, tender figure, relaxed pose, gray eyes, slender legs, and uneven teeth broadly constitute an appearance that a Wilhelminian German such as Aschenbach recognizes as belonging to the fourteen-year-old son of a Polish woman who could very well be married to a German senior official (34), and thus *an adolescent*

Liebe getragen?" (32-33).

among children, *a son* among daughters, and a *Germanized* Pole (cf. Foster 195, 199-201) among vacationing American, Russian, English, German, French, Polish, and other Slavic and Balkan people (32, 38, 40). Since Tadzio is his parents' favorite (33), since he is popular among the other children at the beach, whom he directs with a nod of his head, and from whom he receives kisses of allegiance (40), since he frowns at his Russian foes (39), and since (as mentioned above) the youth in particular testifies to divine inspiration, the function of the *part-German male adolescent* from Aschenbach's perspective is surely to serve as *darling, example, and little chieftain*. Certainly, the sense of *favorite, model, and leader* is transparent in Tadzio's appearance. He is made of such sweet or precious and regal material as honey, marble, ivory, and gold. He is the monumental stuff of sculpture and modernity's inheritance incarnate of ancient culture. By reading his features as at once agreeing with an identity-function, Aschenbach or the narrator may arrange the boy, for example, as differentiated from the "good-natured, yet ugly" Russian children (38) and, so, know him to be much more than just that. Tadzio the beautiful little chieftain bears the sign of the "perfect," "godlike," and "noble" face and is thus seen to be "graceful," "unique," "charming," and "spoilt" by nature.

Aschenbach's reactions to Tadzio both repeat and contrast the protagonist's reception of the other males encountered and described. Again, the same physiognomy that accords Tadzio's positive nature provides the reason why Aschenbach should – in this case – pursue the boy. Early on in the author-figure's acquaintanceship with the boy, the narrator labels Aschenbach's response to the fourteen year old as "that cool professional approval in which artists sometimes cloak their delight and enchantment when faced with a masterpiece."[12] By likening Aschenbach's response to Tadzio to the appreciative relation between an artist and a great painting the narrator considers the author-figure's deliberations on the boy in terms of a well-rehearsed dynamic that benefits the observer. Just as the artist ultimately makes use of the painting as the object of his approval to demonstrate his specialized ability to recognize and confirm the cultural value of the painting and thus also assert his own professional and symbolic superiority as someone skilled or entitled to pass such judgments, so Aschenbach's appraisal of Tadzio's exterior – likewise the declaration of an ideal – indicates the comparative professional rigor of physiognomical behavior and draws attention to the author-figure's particular expertise in such matters. More specifically, Susan von Rohr Scaff regards such behavior as part of Aschenbach's adherence to Platonic principles, for "By professing his perception of essential loveliness through Tadzio ... Aschenbach elevates himself to one of the higher stages of Platonic comprehension" (142). However, Richard White demonstrates – by alluding to Aschenbach's exhaustion after appraising Tadzio and his status as a bad lover – that "*Death in Venice* may be viewed as a challenge to every idealizing impulse, including that of Plato, which seeks to justify the erotic impulse or the pursuit of beauty for the sake of something higher" (61). This would include intellectual realization and professional ambition.

---

[12] "jener fachmännisch kühlen Billigung, in welche Künstler zuweilen einem Meisterwerk gegenüber ihr Entzücken, ihre Hingerissenheit kleiden" (37).

The narrator's definition of Aschenbach's appreciation of Tadzio also reveals the fact that artists and physiognomists on occasion use the ways of their profession – that is, the advantage of the authority garnered from the apparent ability to know 'the likeness of spiritual perfection' when they see it – in order to disguise the pleasure they have in mere looking, a pleasure that seems to be best concealed by and for the sake of professionalism. Aschenbach draws on a similar sense of social decorum when he notices Tadzio's hate for the Russians on the boy's darkening brow (39) – an appearance reminiscent of the protagonist's reaction to the old dandy. Aschenbach responds to the boy's emotional display by turning away out of "a kind of delicacy of feeling or fright, something like respect and shame," although he is "amused and shaken ... delighted."[13] Aschenbach pursues Tadzio, yet when wanting to touch and speak to the boy (in French like the old dandy), the author-figure is afraid of becoming conspicuous and "fails [to make contact], gives up, and walks on by with his head bowed."[14] The narrator again explains the protagonist's behavior by referring to the "nature and character," that is, to "the profound instinctual mix of discipline and unrestraint” required of a professional artist.[15] In fact – mirroring the official line of the hotel management and Venice city administration – Aschenbach is in the habit of keeping up appearances, one that masks excitement with resignation (47) and, in Tadzio’s presence, that is “serious” (40, 60), “educated and dignified”, and in which “nothing betrays any inner feeling.”[16] On one occasion Aschenbach is not quick enough in mounting his guard of “composure and dignity” and so bares his “joy, surprise, and admiration”;[17] at this he flees. Similarly, Aschenbach feels both “triumph” and “horror” at Tadzio’s developing interest in him, but avoids making eye contact for fear that he has already aroused the suspicions of the boy’s mother and governess (69-70). At one point he is so moved by the boy’s mimicry of his serious attitude toward the baritone guitarist that it takes all his strength not to drop his reserve and “bury his face in his hands.”[18] In sum, Aschenbach delights in Tadzio’s appearance, but feels compelled to temper his enjoyment and caution his gaze. Indeed, the author-figure makes a concerted effort to present his neutrality both to the object of his attention and to the surrounding world. As can be deduced from Aschenbach’s reactions to the sight of Tadzio, the author’s position and function relies on a self-regulated appreciation for the boy. Sure enough, Aschenbach’s interest in Tadzio takes a productive, professional turn when the author-figure decides to use the possible part-German Polish boy’s physical contours as the foundation of a small prose treatise and his latest literary venture.[19] Yet Aschenbach is especially mindful not to reveal to his readership the exceptional impetus for his new output and thus transforms his impression of Tadzio into literature only in terms that are acceptable to mainstream society.[20] His *disguised approval*, his cool and serious air when in the presence of the charming figure, imposes the semblance of distance that supposedly limits the extent of the boy's significance in Aschenbach's affairs. However, the apparent distance in effect occasions proximity to the graceful adolescent male that enables the author to take full professional advantage of the model and inspiration of cultural production, a model not unlike the physically frail part-German, part-Bohemian who was Aschenbach as a child (14, 13). The second basic component of the physiognomical negotiation of the author-figure's cultural standing is therefore providing the necessary physical evidence that enables the artist to recognize and assert his personal – and even narcissistic – idea of exemplary form while remaining within the bounds of professional aesthetic standards and established social manners.

---

[13] "Eine Art Zartgefühl oder Erschrockenheit, etwas wie Achtung und Scham"; "erheitert und erschüttert ... beglückt" (39).

[14] "versagt, verzichtet und geht gesenkten Hauptes vorüber" (56).

---

[15] “Wesen und Gepräge”; “die tiefe Instinktverschmelzung von Zucht und Zügellosigkeit” (56).

[16] “In der gebildeten und würdevollen Miene des Älteren verriet nichts eine innere Bewegung” (60).

[17] “Ruhe und Würde”; “Freude, Überraschung, Bewunderung” (60).

[18] “sein Gesicht in den Händen zu verbergen” (73).

[19] “His desire was indeed to work in Tadzio’s presence, to take the lad’s physique as a model as he wrote, to let his style follow the lines of this body that seemed divine to him, and to carry its beauty into the spiritual realm, as the eagle once bore the Trojan shepherd up into the ether”; “Und zwar ging sein Verlangen dahin, in Tadzios Gegenwart zu arbeiten, beim Schreiben den Wuchs des Knaben zum Muster zu nehmen, seinen Stil den Linien dieses Körpers folgen zu lassen, der ihm göttlich schien, und seine Schönheit ins Geistige zu tragen, wie der Adler einst den troischen Hirten zum Äther trug” (55).

It is fundamental for the substantiation of the physiognomies of the man in the portico and of Tadzio respectively to identify the former as a *non-Bavarian* and to imply indirectly by way of the Polish boy's mother's marriage that the latter is *part-German*. Also, Tadzio's likeness to various classical figures suggests and so underlines the fact that, much like the rediscovered articles of antiquity, he must, as a cultural item, fall within the sphere of especially *German* influence (see Foster 194). However, such readings of the *non-Bavarian* portico-man and the *part-German* Tadzio, undertaken by a narrator who presumably mirrors Aschenbach's perspective, are at the same time the result of conjecture. The description of the man in the Munich cemetery as someone with red hair, pale eyes, and white and freckled skin, and carrying "the customary rucksack" (8) would be just as, if not more, fitting for what we are told he is not: *a Bavarian* (cf. Brinkley 8). Likewise, the text gives no *other* indication that Tadzio could be in reality anything but *a Pole* (cf. Foster 199). Evidently, the reader is encouraged to assume that accounts of the outward appearances of the man in the portico, of Tadzio, and of the other male characters – and therefore the workings of their physiognomical meanings – are constructions of Aschenbach's mind and that the impressions they may make have little to do with these figures' real faces or even with their 'apparent' identities.[21]

---

[20] "It is truly a good thing that the world knows only the beautiful work and not also its origins or the conditions under which it came into existence; for knowledge of the sources from which an artist's inspiration flows would often confuse readers, frightening them off, and, so, negating the effects of excellence"; "Es ist sicher gut, daß die Welt nur das schöne Werk, nicht auch seine Ursprünge, nicht seine Entstehungsbedingungen kennt; denn die Kenntnis der Quellen, aus denen dem Künstler Eingebung floß, würde sie oftmals verwirren, abschrecken und so die Wirkungen des Vortrefflichen aufheben" (55).

The physiognomies of the men lining Aschenbach's way are either the product of mistaken identities or, more likely, of willed perceptions on the protagonist's part. They are interpreted this way or that, as a foreign threat or as a 'colonized' inspiration, in order to explain, seemingly by way of their apparent material being, Aschenbach's required reaction of avoidance or pursuit. Seeing these male faces in such ways is helpful to Aschenbach – and to the narrator – to give the impression that the protagonist has not been distracted from his revered cultural vocation, but is rather on a journey guided by established national, professional, and social principles. Indeed, one can assume that Aschenbach would act differently if he were to assign the faces for what they 'really' are. After all, if the man in the portico were openly deemed a Bavarian, Aschenbach would have no reason – as the example of the apparently part-German Tadzio shows – to feel threatened and avoid the unusual figure. They would be compatriots and allies. Likewise, if there were no possibility of imagining Tadzio to be part-German, the protagonist would feel compelled – as the example of the apparent non-Bavarian proves – not cautiously to pursue the boy and express his admiration for him, but rather to scuttle any initial interest and to keep contact to a minimum. For, if not exactly his foe, a Pole in the eyes of a Wilhelminian German such as Aschenbach represents a colonial and geopolitical lesser and thus not someone whom one would tend to exalt. Aschenbach would act in a way similar to Tadzio's aggression aimed at the Russian family on the beach (39). But Aschenbach does not act in these ways. As mentioned above, he avoids the apparently non-Bavarian Bavarian in the chapel portico and – albeit with some hesitation – pursues the apparent part-German who is actually a Pole. Since the portico-man is just as likely to be a Bavarian and since Tadzio is Polish through and through, the physiognomical readings that help to steer Aschenbach as a man of culture away from some and toward another must also be a foil for something else that has, respectively, nothing to do with foreignness and nothing to do with Germanization. Indeed, if the knowledge of faces puts Aschenbach back on track, but the declared national or ethnic identities that substantiate that knowledge are willfully assigned, then some other identity or some other aspect in the way Aschenbach relates to these others must be responsible for substantiating the knowledge – the threat or the standard – contained in those faces. Some dangerous identity other than foreignness must be at the root of Aschenbach's sense of those unusual types who are threatening, shrill, and flamboyant. Some ideal identity other than one affected by Germanization must be at the bottom of Aschenbach's regard for the perfect and graceful lad. And these identities must be, respectively, so disturbing and so precious that they are invisibly contained within common physiognomy under the guises of foreignness or cultural Germanization (which includes a link to the classical Greek ideal) all the while remaining the genuine cause of the protagonist's strategies of avoidance and pursuit that direct his cultural self-interest.

---

[21] For remarks on the figures in some way being products of or projections from Aschenbach's imagination, see also Amory (405); J. Frey (178, 179); von Gronicka (199); Kohut (158); Symington (136); and Traschen (90). Mann maintained that the figures appearing in *Death in Venice* were based on individuals he had encountered in reality ("Lebensabriß" 124).

Since it is Aschenbach's intention to take a break from his usual routine that causes him to invoke a coverup by foreignness or Germanization and so cope with the disturbing or ideal faces that distract or motivate him, analyzing the resulting physiognomies reflects less on those faces and more on the observer. This analysis shows his will to greater cultural authority and the role physiognomy plays in facilitating that endeavor. The earlier discussion of Lavater's physiognomical treatises reveals that his work comprises a complex system that, while claiming to decode external features, in fact encodes the face in order to reproduce existing hierarchies. The resulting physiognomical knowledge and the sociocultural hierarchies it supports reflect the ambition and prejudice of the physiognomist or of that part of society to which he belongs. Lavaterian physiognomy tailors the bare facts of people's appearances to suit or not to suit particular roles, and always in the interests of the cultural establishment. It is a tactic designed to gain influence by fashioning opinion on the meaning, place, and worth of the different members of humanity. Physical descriptions compiled by the observer are material and rhetorical sites in which the observer defines others and at the same time declares his own authority as the type of person best suited for the role of making pronouncements on others. Ultimately, the attempt to know others turns faces into cultural products that one constructs in order to assert and know one's own function and position. The face of the person observed becomes a screen for the conditions of the special interests of the observer as he projects his self-definition as an authoritative position taken in the dynamics of society.

Similarly, in his study of literary portrait *... fertig ist das Angesicht*, Peter von Matt argues that, in this genre, the role of the real-life face that motivates description is significantly limited (cf. Niehaus 425). By way of explanation, Matt evokes the German philologist Wilhelm von Humboldt's assertion that language is not complete enough to convey all the subtleties of the human face and character (97). Matt maintains that, once confronted with this insufficiency of language to communicate the peculiarities of an individual's face, authors can only enumerate certain characteristics or special features and thereby produce not the face, but an additional layer of signs (97). Matt also draws on the German satirist Georg Christoph Lichtenberg's criticism of the physiognomist's tendency to speak in a specialized language understood only by other physiognomists and thus unintelligible to the uninitiated (97). Matt then suggests – presumably because of the simultaneous inadequacy and overspecialization of language – that those authors intent on revealing the impressions of certain faces necessarily go beyond mere surface details to compose literary portraits and physiognomies that in the end tell less about the people observed than they do about the author (97-98; see also Graham, "Contexts" 141; Rivers "'L'homme hiéroglyphié'" 159).

Matt's approach to explaining an author's understanding and communication of the face implicitly evokes the dialectic of reading discussed by exponents of *Rezeptionsästhetik* (reception-theory) and of reader-response criticism (cf. esp. 192-93) such as Wolfgang Iser and Stanley Fish, respectively. After all, physiognomical authors are themselves primarily readers of faces. Essentially, in order not to provide a physiognomy only for physiognomists' sake, that is, in order ostensibly to communicate the meaning of another's face effectively to a wide audience, the author/physiognomical observer relies on a number of associations or stock cultural allusions. These allusions are brought to the face by the face-reader from the catalogue of his/her experiences in the effort to interpret, that is, fill in the "gaps" or the "indeterminacy" in the text of, the basic features (or in the 'divine plan') of the actual face with his/her "own faculty for making connections" or will to understand and formulate the unformulated (thus, Iser). Since these allusions are not realized in the actual face, but virtually and exclusively in the imagination of the author/observer, they eventually supplant the basic facts of the real face. Furthermore, while these allusions are, on the one hand, formulations of the self that strive toward understanding, once subsequently articulated as a literary excursion, they serve, on the other hand, more or less as "interpretive strategies" that the author/observer expects to resonate with the reading public or "interpretive community" because in the effort to understand that public as well draws on memories and experiences, ones they may share with the observer (thus, Fish). As such, the allusions or strategies represent common ways of thinking about particular topics and thus indicate a series of social norms and expectations. As Peter von Matt claims, the descriptive portrait of the face is a construction comprised of social and psychological projections that are universally taken for granted (202). In fact, Matt argues that physiognomical description is "the expression of the way [the author or observer] sees himself socially and artistically" (1), that it reflects "the relation between author [i.e., observer] and social reality" (53), and that the moral and social norms inextricably linked with the act of describing faces make the observer present in the physiognomy of the observed (98).

A closer examination of the narrator's accounts of Aschenbach's observations shows the basic details of the face to be supplanted by a number of associations or cultural allusions. These allusions provide fertile contexts for expanding on the bare facts of the faces and thus act as triggers in the reader's imagination that help to establish meaningful physiognomical connotations about those faces (cf. Matt 193). Of course, it is in the nature of the genre of physiognomical description that, when attempting to convey the impression of a face, the observer accumulates allusions and constructs details that, while approximating the face observed, are nonetheless born of the observer's own socially contingent experiences. Accordingly, the allusions summoned in Aschenbach's observations also provide the critical reader with a number of explicit revelations with which to analyze not the characters to whom those faces belong, but rather Aschenbach and the way he negotiates his own position in society. The supplementary details born of Aschenbach's faculty for making connections – his reiteration of existing thought and culture in the descriptions of the observed – tell us most of all how this authority on the nature of people formulates himself. Aschenbach reads the faces of the man in the portico, of the old dandy, of Tadzio, and so on, not entirely for what they are, but for how someone in Aschenbach's position, as a literary author and celebrated member of a specialized community of cultural producers, is disposed and expected to see them. His perspective reveals elements of his own life experiences – the set of norms and universal truths according to which he has chosen to conduct his life. Thus the physiognomical descriptions discussed above are sites from which one may consider and analyze the protagonist in his role as physiognomist and author.

The supplementary allusions underscoring the physiognomical assertion of the portico-man's frightening and problematic foreignness, though misleading by willfully turning a compatriot into a foreigner, bear witness not just to Aschenbach's capacity to imagine foreignness, but specifically to the author-figure's experience of the genuine threat posed by the unexpected figure, a threat intrinsically dangerous to the author-figure's social position. The text begins the description of the basic features of the portico-man's face with animal terms and focuses especially on the figure's fanglike teeth, thus indicating that the threat posed by this supposed foreigner involves a savage appetite that gnaws at Aschenbach. Likewise, the fashion statement of the wide-brimmed straw hat, red scarf, and yellow suit bring to mind a dandy style that reveals the threat also to be contrary to convention. Meanwhile, the walking stick and the rucksack provide a popular-culture reference to the *Wandervogel* (a predominantly male youth movement of hikers), indicating that the threat concerns the question of masculinity. But perhaps the most significant allusion summoned via the account of the unusual figure's appearance is the subtle evocation of the opening chapter of Adelbert von Chamisso's *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte*.[22] By including in this episode words such as "d[as] Fremdländische[]" ("foreign" or "exotic," 8) and "de[r] Fremde[]" ("foreigner" or "stranger" 9), by staging the scene in a cemetery next to a public garden with a setting sun (8), by making the figure grimace (8) and return

---

[22] Reed provides a further link to Chamisso in suggesting that Mann's admiration for the earlier author's ability to move on from his hit story to become a mature, recognized cultural and scholarly figure in the eyes of a further generation was the same status Mann wished to attain with and the same process Aschenbach was undergoing in *Death in Venice* (*Making and Unmaking* 7; *Text* 133-34, 149).

Aschenbach's glances (9) and then by having Aschenbach feel both embarrassed and transfixed (9) and, finally, decide to embark on a journey to a southern resort, the narrator locates Aschenbach's perspective on the unusual man within the realm of the fictional Schlemihl's infamous encounter with the Gray Man where he is seduced into selling his shadow, an act that the earlier literary character soon comes to regret, since his shadowlessness entails that he must suffer the pain of public scorn or turn to deception to maintain a respectable position in society.

Clearly, deception is also involved in the associations employed in the physiognomical reading of the man in the portico. For while lending themselves to the construction of foreignness by way of the evocation of other species, imported fashion, the explorer, and the migrant from overseas, the cultural meanings of animals, of dandyism, of the *Wandervogel* movement, and of *Peter Schlemihl* in fact betray some other matter occupying Aschenbach's fantasy. The threat that is foisted on the reader as foreign aggression and deceit has little to do with foreignness per se. Concerned with physical craving, unconventionality, masculinity, and seduction, the declaration of foreign physiognomy is rather a screen for 'improper' sexual predatoriness. Robert Tobin points out how the encounter with the portico-man pivots about the German word *treiben* (drive) and that the whole scene operates like a sexual come-on ("Life and Works" 229-30; "Why is Tadzio a Boy?" 220-21). The allusions summoned in the account of the man in the portico, as well as Aschenbach's assertion of the man's face as threateningly foreign and his impulse to avert his gaze and wipe his face, are triggered by a homosexual aspect of the encounter. The animal hunger is really carnal desire. The red scarf is a sartorial code for homosexuals and male prostitutes (Tobin, "Life and Works" 235). The dandy has long been considered one of the possible visual manifestations of the homosexual man (Hartwig 905). Various *Wandervogel* groups were accused of being homoerotic outfits (Steakley, *Homosexual Emancipation* 54-56). As well, the above chapter on *Peter Schlemihl* shows how that novel traces the social consequences of open same-sex sexual attraction.[23] Finally, Aschenbach's daydream following the encounter involves a geography that is as erotic as it is exotic (see also Jofen 240). There are “leaves as thick as hands,” “giant ferns,” “fat, swollen vegetation with remarkable blooms,” “curiously distorted trees whose roots were growing straight out of the trunk and sank through the air into the ground and water,” “milk-white blossoms,” “strange high-shouldered birds with deformed beaks,” “a clattering grinding and rustling,” and “gnarled bamboo canes.”[24] In fact, on closer inspection, the body that Aschenbach declares *non-Bavarian* is particularly reminiscent of the nineteenth-century homosexual activist Karl Heinrich Ulrichs's and the sexologist Magus Hirschfeld's theorizations of the Uranian or third sex. It is both effeminate (beardless; the waist and hips as focal point) and exaggeratedly masculine (protruding Adam's apple; heightened, domineering pose). The androgynous mix of the *sexuelle Zwischenstufen* (intersexual variants) is reverberated in the transverse of the snub nose[25] and the furrowed brow, while the suggestion of a facial deformity connects with the medicalization of ‘queer’ bodies.[26]

---

[23] See Brinkley on how the description of the portico-man alludes to the portrait in Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* (8). Clearly, I maintain the allusion harks further back to the earlier literary figure of Chamisso's *Schlemihl* and, thus, to a text that not only occurs within the German literary tradition, but also

The account of Aschenbach's reception of the man in the portico illustrates in exemplary fashion how physiognomical practices amount to a mechanism that can be summoned by a cultural producer to deflect danger, and in this case the social recrimination of a man who pursues same-sex sexual attraction. As a figure highly attuned to his times, Aschenbach would be well aware of the proscription against homosexuality. In Thomas Mann's experience of the German society of Aschenbach's day, open homosexuality was not

---

likely influenced Wilde's text.

[24] “Blätter[], so dick wie Hände ... riesige[] Farne[] ... fette[s], gequollene[s] und abenteuerlich blühende[s] Pflanzenwerk ... haarige Palmenschäfte ... wunderlich ungestalte Bäume, deren Wurzeln dem Stamm entwuchsen und sich durch die Luft in den Boden, ins Wasser senkten ... milchweiße Blumen ... Vögel von fremder Art, hochschultrig, mit unförmigen Schnäbeln ... ein klapperndes Wetzen und Rauschen ... knotige[] Rohrstämmen” (10).

[25] Traschen reminds us that Socrates had a snub nose, as did the satyrs (90).

[26] See Steakley on especially Ulrichs's consideration of effeminate men (*Homosexual Emancipation* esp. 6, 8, 15-17). See also Jones on the third sex. See Steakley (“Iconography”) for a discussion of the graphic representation of the third sex as “bug-eyed, wasp-waisted aliens” (242) with “elongated head[s]” (248) and “alien physiognom[ies]” (see also figs. 6 [260] and 10 [262]). See Steakley (*Homosexual Emancipation* 13) for the shift in the German debate on homosexuality from the judicial realm to the medical one. For medical discourse and homosexuality, see Foucault's *The History of Sexuality*.

tolerated among or by those men occupying public positions of influence (even if some of them were homosexual).[27] This group included among others such men as royal confidant Alfred Krupp, Center Party leader Chaplain Dasbach, Prince Philipp zu Eulenburg,[28] Count Kuno von Moltke, Prince Friedrich Heinrich of Prussia, and Chancellor Bernhard von Bülow, men who in the first decade of the twentieth century were the object of some accusation or public scandal of a homosexual kind that also raised concerns of national interests (see Steakley). This group included men like Aschenbach's forefathers, "officers, judges, administrative officials ... in service of king and country" (13), or like the German senior official to whom Aschenbach imagines Tadzio's mother to be married (34); thus, men in nature similar to Aschenbach himself or to other important nationally recognized cultural producers.[29] Consequently, Aschenbach knows he must recoil from homosexual encounters if he is not to jeopardize his cultural recognition. But such is the climate of suspicion that, as he recoils, he must take care not to incriminate himself by giving away his ability to intuit others' homosexual tendencies or the fact that for some reason he finds himself in situations where he encounters homosexuals in the first place. Thus, sensing a possible homosexual interlude, Aschenbach willfully interprets the queer physiognomy of the Bavarian in the portico of a Munich cemetery chapel as that of a non-Bavarian to explain away his reaction and cover his intuition.

The same pattern prevails with Aschenbach's subsequent encounters with the other similarly unusual and negative males. Again, the allusions used to relay the physiognomical assertion of the hostile and tricky itinerant aliens also reveal that the emphasis on their foreignness is a willful interpretation orchestrated to deflect from the real cause of the threat to *von* Aschenbach, a bourgeois German writer. For instance, the old sailor's, the gondolier's, the elevator boy's, and the baritone guitarist's grins or grimaces (21, 28, 48, 70, 71), the designation of the old sailor and the man with the goatee as "strange, shadowy figures" (24), and the clerk's, gondolier's, and guitarist's colorful attire (22-23, 28, 70) repeat the impression of the portico-man's appearance and carry forward the references contained in that first figure to the queer encounter in Chamisso's *Peter Schlemihl* and to the implication of people of the third sex inherent in dandy fashion. Indeed, the threat that both confirms and is confirmed by these characters' physiognomically underscored foreignness finds its origins in the recurring opportunity they present Aschenbach to realize the kind of illicit sexual desire that would compromise the author's cultural standing. The focus on the way the dandy clerk manipulates his tongue, salivates, and sucks his fingers (25-26), in combination with his loud speculation that Aschenbach is about to meet his lover (here, revealingly, the diminutive neuter "[das] Liebchen," 26), can surely be read as an anticipation of oral sex. The gondolier's forceful and full-bodied stroke (28), his gentle rocking of Aschenbach from behind, and the protagonist's thoughts of having fallen into the hands of some criminal (29) amount to the simulation of anal penetration and to the projection of a seduction fantasy akin to storylines of gay erotica or pornographic animation (see also Jofen 242; Tobin, "Life and Works" 234; "Why is Tadzio a Boy?" 225). The guitarist's antics with his tongue (70, 74) and the swollen veins on his head (70) again provide a sexual undertone to Aschenbach's observation. As well, the speculation that the comical, pimplike buffo-baritone is likely Neapolitan is possibly an attempt to evoke the *femminielli*, or male transvestite prostitutes of the Spanish Quarter of Naples.[30] Clearly put on the spot by the chance to follow up on homosexuality – a disposition that, if it were to come to light, would soon make Aschenbach's cultural celebrity untenable – the author-figure consistently calls upon the art of physiognomy to emphasize particularly the foreignness of the men he encounters and thus hide the real threat from which, for the sake of maintaining his power and influence, he is obliged to withdraw.

---

[27] For a general understanding of the experiences of homosexuals at the time, see works by Higgins (esp. 135-36), Jones, Oosterhuis, Steakley, and Taeger. The degree of tolerance for or intolerance of homosexuality in Germany at Aschenbach and Mann's time is also reflected in the reception of Mann's novella (see Böhm 17-59).

[28] For references pertaining to Mann's interest in the Eulenburg trial, see Böhm (302-05); and Margetts (337n24).

[29] Aschenbach equates the nature of his professional life with theirs: "He too had served, he too had practiced the hard discipline, he too had been a soldier and warrior, just like many of them. For art was a war, an exhausting battle for which nowadays one could not stay fit for long. A life of self-conquest and of defiance, an austere, steadfast, and sober life, which he had formed into the symbol of the tender heroism of the day – and well he should call this manly, or even brave "; "Auch er hatte gedient, auch er sich in harter Zucht geübt; auch er war Soldat und Kriegsmann gewesen, gleich manchen von ihnen, – denn die Kunst war ein Krieg, ein aufreibender Kampf, für welchen man heute nicht lange taugte. Ein Leben der Selbstüberwindung und des Trotzdem, ein herbes, standhaftes und enthaltsames Leben, das er zum Sinnbild für einen zarten und zeitgemäßen Heroismus gestaltet hatte, – wohl durfte er es männlich, durfte es tapfer nennen" (66).

---

[30] See also Heilbut (257). For an account of modern-day *femminielli*, see Browning (39-86).

As in the observations of the negative men, the physiognomical descriptions of Tadzio are less an expression of the boy's character than they are a projection of Aschenbach's circumstances. While the narrator donates a significant amount of text to outlining Tadzio's figure, the resulting portrait nonetheless remains rather sketchy. It is relatively generic: Tadzio has a face, hair, a nose, eyes, legs, etc., that appear this way or that way and thus are – in Aschenbach's eyes – appealing and divine. With words alone the narrator can only fail to replicate the boy fully and precisely. As the narrator remarks, Tadzio's smile is indescribable (42) or, "He was more beautiful than words could say" (60); and Aschenbach is painfully aware "that language can only praise sensual beauty, not reproduce it" (60). Consequently, as in other examples, the patchy detail of the actual face is supplemented with stock cultural allusions. John Frey remarks that Aschenbach's "physical look ... turns into a spiritual seeing" that "conjures up images from antiquity and myth" (187). In fact, in the narrator's account of Aschenbach's observation of Tadzio, the allusions include references to history of art (Spinario or 'the slave boy extracting a thorn,' Greek sculpture, half profile, Parian marble), mythology (Spinario, Eros), fashion and manners (long hair, an English sailor's suit, black patent leather shoes, a pose unlike his sisters', downcast eyes), pathology ('was he poorly?' looking paler, bad teeth, anemia), and child rearing ('softness and tenderness,' 'pampered favorite'). Once again, since the allusions associated with the face reflect the observer's cultural experiences, Aschenbach's physiognomical regard for Tadzio serves as a resource for analyzing the author-figure's negotiation of his position in society. Primarily, Tadzio's face and figure – as seen through the discourses of art, mythology, fashion and manners, pathology, and pedagogy – provide a ready means for Aschenbach to exercise his knowledge of *the boy* as the locale of cultural ideals and thus to express the degree of his own cultural learning.

Aschenbach demonstrates that he is familiar with the artistic appreciation of the male form particularly as initiated by Johann Joachim Winckelmann in his art-historical treatises (and whose final days find rough parallels in Aschenbach's Hadean encounter with the criminal gondolier, the gladly abandoned attempt to return north to Germany, and his death in a northern Italian city on the Adriatic). Indeed, not only does Tadzio's face resemble Greek sculpture, or his skin have the quality of marble, but Aschenbach's attempt to get to know "every line and pose" (52) of Tadzio's body has the effect of turning the boy into a sculpture. The following description of Tadzio on the beach contains references to the drapery, tools, posing, lighting, and materials familiar to the manufacturing and exhibition of sculpture. It also evokes the sexual indeterminacy, the imagery of water and fluidity, that dreamy state between sleep and consciousness, and the fondness for the fluff upon the adolescent's skin that recent commentators on Winckelmann have noted as the hallmarks of that earlier culture critic's descriptions of statues and their ideal pubescent models.[31]

> He would lie at full length, with his bathing towel wrapped around his chest, his fine-chiseled arm resting on the sand, his chin in the hollow of his hand ... and there could be nothing more enchanting than the way the distinguished one smiled with his eyes and lips as he would look up ... He would stand at the water's edge, alone ... upright, his hands clasped behind his neck, slowly rocking on the balls of his feet and dreaming into the blue yonder, while little waves ran up and bathed his toes. His honey-colored hair clung in ringlets to his temples and the back of his neck, the sun sparkled in the down at the top of his spine, the fine outline of his ribs, the symmetry of his chest revealed themselves through the tight skin covering his torso, his armpits were still as smooth as a statue's, the hollows of his knees glistened, and their blue veins made his body look as if it were made of transparent material. What discipline, what precision of thought were expressed in this outstretched, youthfully perfect body![32]

---

[31] See esp. MacLeod, "The 'Third Sex'" (199-201); Parker (540-41); Richter, *Laocoon's Body* (55). See also Richter, Ch. 2 "Winckelmann: Laocoon and the Eunuch," *Laocoon's Body* (38-61, esp. 40-41). Amory demonstrates Thomas Mann's use of various classical writing styles in *Death in Venice*. See also Reed on the use of "statuesque language" in Mann's novella (*Uses* 146-48). Gockel explains Tadzio's becoming a sculpture in the context of the affect upon Mann of Nietzsche's understanding of Apollonian forces (37f.).

[32] "Er lag ausgestreckt, das Badetuch um die Brust geschlungen, den zart gemeißelten Arm in den Sand gestützt, das Kinn in den hohlen Hand ... und nichts konnte bezaubernder sein, als das Lächeln der Augen und Lippen, mit dem der Ausgezeichnete ... aufblickte. Er stand am Rande der See, allein ... – aufrecht, die Hände im Nacken verschlungen, langsam sich auf den Fußballen schaukelnd, und träumte ins Blaue, während kleine Wellen, die anliefen, seine Zehen badeten. Sein honigfarbenes Haar schmiegte sich in Ringeln an die Schläfen und in den Nacken, die Sonne erleuchtete den Flaum des oberen Rückgrates, die feine Zeichnung der Rippen,

As the abovementioned figures of Spinario and Eros indicate, the narrator is also keen to interject allusions to particularly classical mythology and legend into Aschenbach's interest in Tadzio. In the next excerpt, the narrator equates Tadzio's smile with that of Narcissus and, presumably following Aschenbach's thought processes, seems immediately to lose sight of the Polish boy in the appearance and tragedy of the ancient Greek figure: "It was the smile of Narcissus who bends over the mirroring water, that profound, enchanted, protracted smile with which he reaches out his arms toward the reflection of his own beauty – a very slightly contorted smile, contorted by the hopelessness of his endeavor to kiss the charming lips of his shadow, a smile that is coquettish, curious, and a little pained, beguiled and beguiling."[33] Aschenbach calls Tadzio "little Phaeacian!" (36) and "Hyacinthus" (59), and suggests that he is the son of Alcibiades for Jaschu is "Critobulus" (40). He draws a parallel between their potential relationship and that of Socrates and Phaedrus (54) in a way that includes attention to physical appearances – "an elderly man and a young one, an ugly man and a beautiful one, the wise with the loveable" (54). He imagines the effect of Tadzio's existence on his creativity in the terms of the story of Ganymede and Zeus – "as the eagle once bore the Trojan shepherd up into the ether" (55). Other figures and stories evoked by the narrator, either directly or as Aschenbach's daydreams and imaginings, include those of Helios (49), Oceanus in Elysium (50), Amor (53), Acheloüs (54), Semele and Zeus (54), Eos and Tithonus, Cleitus, Cephalus, the Olympians, Orion, Poseidon (58), Pan, Apollo, Zephyr (59), and Hermes (87). The abundance of such allusions tells the reader one thing above all else: Aschenbach is undeniably extremely well-read in the classics.[34] But the descriptions of

---

das Gleichmaß der Brust traten durch die knappe Umhüllung des Rumpfes hervor, seine Achselhöhlen waren noch glatt wie bei einer Statue, seine Kniekehlen glänzten, und ihr bläuliches Geäder ließ seinen Körper wie aus klarem Stoffe gebildet erscheinen. Welch eine Zucht, welche Präzision des Gedankens war ausgedrückt in diesem gestreckten und jugendlich vollkommenen Leibe!" (52-53).

[33] "Es war das Lächeln des Narziß, der sich über das spiegelnde Wasser neigt, jenes tiefe, bezauberte, hingezogene Lächeln, mit dem er nach dem Widerschein der eigenen Schönheit die Arme streckt, – ein ganz wenig verzerrtes Lächeln, verzerrt von der Aussichtslosigkeit seines Trachtens, die holden Lippen seines Schattens zu küssen, kokett, neugierig und leise gequält, betört und betörend" (61).

[34] For further information on the classical allusions in *Death in Venice*, see Amory; Berger ("Thomas Mann" 58-63, 75); Bridges; Deuse; Frank; von Gronicka (203-05); Gustafson; Kelley; Lehnert; Marson; Mautner; Michael; Nicklas (45-52); Reed (*Uses* 156-75); Ritter ("A Critical History" 95ff.); Scaff; Tobin ("Life and Works" 234; "Why is Tadzio a Boy?" 227, 229-30); Traschen; Vaget (170-75); and R. White.

Tadzio are a projection of Aschenbach not merely insofar as they embody the breadth of the author-figure's reading – both of the classics and of their reception particularly by August von Platen[35] and by Friedrich Nietzsche.[36] The descriptions of Tadzio also reflect Aschenbach's interest in the meaning of certain aspects of those classical – and fine art – texts. The effect of the allusions connected with Tadzio has not been to pin the boy down as the readily imaginable, exact likeness of any one of the figures invoked either in appearance or in character. Rather, any sense of the 'real' boy is dispersed among Aschenbach's general knowledge of ancient Greek and Roman culture as a vague reminiscence of an ephebic youth. Thus by deliberating on Tadzio's appearance, Aschenbach summons to the fore of *his own* consciousness and circumstances a way of regarding youth, that is to say, a way of regarding an older man's relation to male youth, that was supposedly peculiar to the customs of classical culture.

The series of allusions that depart from Tadzio's basic physique to assert his graceful part-Germanness – an ethnic conversion only further cemented from the German perspective by modern German culture's inheritance of ancient Greek culture – ultimately reveal how the Germanization of the Pole is a strategy designed at once to bolster the author-figure's claim to cultural authority and to deflect the real cause of his interest in the boy. Several critics have pointed out that many of the classical allusions in *Death in Venice* are specifically homosexual references. For example, Robert Tobin has most recently pointed to the presence of Hyacinthus, Ganymede, Socrates, and Plato as homosexual markers ("Life and Works" 234) and how "Aschenbach is specifically thinking of certain elements of Greek culture that were ... open to forms of same-sex desire" (1998: 239). Similarly, Robert K. Martin remarks that "The model of Plato's *Symposium* ... would serve Mann as the basis for the sexual aesthetics of *Death in Venice*" (59) and that "The friendship tradition evoked in *Tonio Kröger* is enlarged in *Death in Venice* to focus on the Greek tradition, seen as the basis of intellectual growth, of erotic love between an older man and a youth" (63). Also, Ernst A. Schmidt sees a correlation between *Death in Venice* and Virgil's Corydon-*Eclogue* in the constellation of the artist and man-boy love, and Claus Sommerhage reveals by way of psychoanalysis the homoerotic dimension of the Socratic source of Aschenbach's dreams and daydreams (91-97).

---

[35] For the influence of Platen on *Death in Venice*, see Busch; Mautner (23-24); Nicklas (37-39); and Seyppel.

[36] For the influence of Nietzsche's thought on Aschenbach and *Death in Venice*, see Braverman/Nachman (292); Cadieux; Del Caro; Dierks (18-59); Farrelly; Gockel (35-40); Nicholls (77-91); Parkes; Reed (*Making and Unmaking* esp. 76-79; *Uses* 155 & 171); Scaff; Traschen (esp. 97-100); and R. White (63).

The suggestion that classical allusions serve as a location of specifically homosexual references can also be made of each of the other discourses alluded to in the descriptions of Tadzio. The traditions of art history, fashion, pathology, and pedagogy all incorporate aspects that, when evoked in male-male contexts and in combination with each other, have the potential to add up as indices of queerness. By echoing Winckelmann's manner of discussing the plastic arts, the allusions to sculpture evoke a treatment of beauty in art by a man who, as Paul Derks insists, was able to conceive an ideal of beauty in the way he did only because he was a homosexual (208; see also Detering 335). In fact, the homosexual valency of Tadzio's sculpturelike pose is twice accented since, with his hands clasped behind him and with the tight covering of skin across his torso, this seminude replicates depictions of Saint Sebastian who, along with Ganymede, as Martin rightly claims, comprises one of "The two greatest subjects of homosexual art" (64).[37] By selecting only those clothes that the wardrobe of aristocratic childhood has appropriated from the navy or shares in common with the dandy, the allusions to fashion at once suggest recognized yet covert locales of homosexuality. In the readiness to diagnose Tadzio with chlorosis, the text possibly indicates, as Tobin argues for the novella's undercurrent theme of cholera, "an awareness of the importance of medical discourses in creating modern notions of sexuality" ("Life and Works" 238; see also Hayes/Quinby 167, 171). Finally, by isolating Tadzio's demeanor as indicative of a favorite child and thus barely removed from Socrates' favorite pupil Phaedrus evoked later, even the passing comments on the boy's upbringing tie in with a pedagogical tradition built on male-male erotic relations (see also Tobin, "Life and Works" 239).

---

[37] Martin's assertion can be easily substantiated by visiting El Gladiator's on-line gay art museum *El Museo del Gayo* that features depictions of Saint Sebastian by several artists from different periods. For an extensive list of depictions of Saint Sebastian in painting and sculpture with many links to images, see Giua's website *The Iconography of Saint Sebastian*. Venable considers the dandy clerk as "a loathsome travesty of the Sebastian-like hero-type" (28). See also Heilbut (252); Tobin ("Why is Tadzio a Boy?" 222).

Aschenbach's perception of Tadzio thus saturates the boy's looks with extraneous contexts, all of which concern those aspects of cultural heritage historically selected by gay men as representative of their psyche. Tadzio is rendered not as a Polish lad on vacation but as a classically cultured part-German, an ancient Greek demigod, a dead ringer for Sebastian, or a sailor boy, who is popular with the boys and possibly suffers from a poor constitution, not because he is anything but a Polish lad on vacation, but because in speaking of his own learning Aschenbach selects those areas of culture that resonate the most with him. That is, Aschenbach draws on aspects of the discourses of art history, classical mythology, pathology, etc., that enable the author-figure to remind himself that he is an authoritative member of the cultural community, to realize a culturally necessary homosexual sensitivity, and perhaps, as Tobin maintains, to teach Aschenbach to 'construct' his own sexuality ("Life and Works" 237-42).

Aschenbach's reflections on Tadzio's face and figure thus amount to a projection of the learned self whose professional interest in that learning is concomitant with finding a concrete manifestation of his own possible homosexual sensibility. Indeed, it is only by taking on the responsibility for assembling Tadzio's physiognomy that Aschenbach comes to his self-realization. He wonders whether the controlled force that produces the sculpture-like boy – that is, of course, the Winckelmannian desire that invented the modern ideal of beauty – is also at work in him: "And yet the strict and pure will that had labored in darkness and prevailed in bringing [Tadzio] this divine sculpture to light – was it not known and familiar to him, the artist? Was it not also at work in him when, filled with prudent passion, he liberated from the marble mass of language the slender form that he saw in his mind and that he presented to mankind as the model and mirror of intellectual beauty?"[38]

The above quotation is a pointed confession of the homosexual inspiration underlying the prevailing understanding of the ability to recognize beauty[39] and thus potentially modern artistic production itself. Perhaps it avows that classicized Western culture is underpinned by queer sentiment (see Martin 64). Certainly, Aschenbach's four most recent works – a prose epic on Frederick the Great, the novel *Maja*, the tale *An Abject Man*, and a theoretical treatise on spirit and art that is compared by critics to works by Schiller (see Wysling) – indicate the author-figure's possible homosexual sympathy if not only for the fact that they feature the type of hero best symbolized by Sebastian (16) or, as Eugene McNamara blithely puts it, "the suffering homosexual" (233; see also Tobin "Life and Works" 232; "Why is Tadzio a Boy?" 222-24). But Aschenbach does not simply make a theme out of homosexuality, and nor does Tadzio merely remain a fixture of Aschenbach's private fantasy. As mentioned above, the Polish boy's physiognomical image becomes the foundation for creative writing. In this, of course, Aschenbach directly apes Winckelmann's conception of the male aesthetic ideal after the physique of Friedrich Reinhold von Berg. Since Aschenbach's works generally concern queer figures, and his very latest work summons Winckelmann's queer project not just in terms of depicting Tadzio or of biographical parallels but specifically in the way Aschenbach performs the process of writing, it has to be stressed that in considering Aschenbach's physiognomy of Tadzio one is particularly concerned with the projection of the type of homosexuality responsible for literary production, a homosexuality, it seems, that is peculiar to, or characteristic of, such important figures as authors and cultural producers. The good fortune of Tadzio's appearance coalesces with the projection of especially *the writer as homosexual*.

---

[38] "Der strenge und reine Wille jedoch, der, dunkel tätig, dies göttliche Bildwerk ans Licht zu treiben vermocht hatte, – war er nicht ihm, dem Künstler, bekannt und vertraut? Wirkte er nicht auch in ihm, wenn er, besonnener Leidenschaft voll, aus der Marmormasse der Sprache die schlanke Form befreite, die er im Geiste geschaut und die er als Standbild und Spiegel geistiger Schönheit den Menschen darstellte?" (53).

However, in the cultural collage that comprises Tadzio's physiognomy, the coincident projection of Aschenbach the writer-and-homosexual is also in no way a pure or unmitigated version of this observer and protagonist. The expression of Aschenbach delivered in the descriptions of Tadzio necessarily takes on a form that agrees with the social proscriptions regulating the circumstances of a writer-and-homosexual (cf. Hayes/Quinby 162). As a result of the intolerance of influential men for men-loving men at the time, the specter of homosexuality that is relayed – along with that of the learned canonical author – through another's physiognomy abidingly comes to shape only in a carefully mediated or sublimated manner. Though it is hard to imagine how his readers would not see it, the author-figure certainly has no intention of revealing to them in any direct way the exceptional impetus for his output (see n20 above). Ignace Feuerlicht remarks that in *Death in Venice* Mann's "choice of classical Greek elements is explained indirectly by his assertion that the homoerotic Platen cultivated the Persian ghazal, the Renaissance sonnet, and the Pindaric ode because these genres also dealt with pederasty and gave it literary legitimacy. Thus the erotic feelings in Platen's works could be viewed by his readers as traditional, impersonal, and inoffensive" (94; cf. Marson 122; cf. Swales, *Thomas Mann* 42). Similarly, to avoid courting suspicion, Aschenbach reflects upon Tadzio and transforms him into literature only in terms that, while locating homosexual desire, at once subordinate or divert that desire to ends that are useful to mainstream society. Aschenbach draws on those queer contexts that are sanctioned and available only because they also already sustain the predominance of male-oriented authority. Winckelmann's aesthetic ideal of male youth, classical stories of the gods' love for beautiful youth, the nineteenth-century sexologists' theorizing of sexual inverts, the single-sex signifier of uniforms or the distinctive style of dandy attire, and the Socratic tradition represent the type of systems used in the broader culture to promote the so-called 'civilizing and healthy potential of male bonds' or the 'unsurpassable standard of the male' (see esp. Mosse). Thus the physiognomical descriptions of Tadzio both accommodate Aschenbach's homosexuality and, in accordance with hegemonic prohibition, immediately limit it. The rendition of Tadzio reflects the only way society permits a man such as Aschenbach – a writer and homosexual – to be, see, and still function as a creative individual. Consequently, Aschenbach is not the genius of the pure knowing subject proposed by Arthur Schopenhauer (cf. Braverman/Nachman 292-93; see also Heilbut 247; R. White 62-63). The allusions drawn upon by Aschenbach's physiognomical take on Tadzio show his turning a foreigner into a part-German to be motivated by a homosexuality that in other instances the author-figure is obliged to avoid. Aschenbach provides Tadzio with an air of classicism that bespeaks cultured Germanness only because he needs a decoy for the homosexual aspect of his self-interested pursuit of cultural authority. Whereas with the negative men Aschenbach uses physiognomy to avoid the issue of homosexuality altogether, with Tadzio the author-figure realizes he may use the discourse of the beautiful face to shield a homosexuality that is necessary as far as modern aesthetics are concerned.

---

[39] The reference is surely to Winckelmann's 1763 letter to Friedrich Reinhold von Berg *Abhandlung von der Fähigkeit der Empfindung des Schönen in der Kunst, und dem Unterrichte in derselben* (*Treatise on the Ability to Recognize Beauty in Art and on the Schooling in that Ability*).

Aschenbach knows what he is doing. This is not a case of self-deception (cf. Furst 162). Any writer must appeal to the broader will of society if he is to find professional success. Certainly the narrator is aware of the fact that artists are compelled to respond favorably to the whims and dictates of the establishment: "Inborn in almost every artistic nature is a luxuriant and treacherous tendency to appreciate the injustice that creates beauty, to show an interest in aristocratic preference and pay it homage."[40] By drawing on, yet shrouding, homosexuality in dualistic discourses, Aschenbach knows he will keep the honor the nation bestows upon his works (12) and further the consensus he shares with his generation (15). He gives a society that privileges males exactly what it expects: through Aschenbach's eyes, Tadzio strikes "a pose of casual grace and quite unlike the almost subservient stiffness to which his sisters appeared to have adapted themselves" (33). Critics have pointed out that Thomas Mann and Aschenbach alike are quick to realize in the realm of fiction the opportunity for the subsistence – even success – to be had by queers should they take on the role of supporting the norm. Robert K. Martin points out how in the story *Tonio Kröger* the character of the effeminate dance instructor Knaak "turns his status as outsider to his advantage and provides an example of the way society uses such marginal figures as part of a structure of social control" (60): "Knaak, with his assumption of the role of what Michel Foucault calls 'surveillance,' illustrates the fragility of gender definition as well as the phenomenon of the 'house-nigger,' in which society can claim tolerance by allowing isolated figures the appearance of freedom, provided of course that they serve only to perpetuate the system of exclusion from which they are temporarily exempt" (61). Similarly, Robert Tobin insists that there is "something gay in almost every element of Aschenbach's writing" and that Aschenbach "consistently writes about the artistic benefits of the repression or sublimation of homosexuality; he sings the productivity of the closet"

---

[40] "Fast jedem Künstlernaturell ist ein üppiger und verräterischer Hang eingeboren, Schönheit schaffende Ungerechtigkeit anzuerkennen und aristokratischer Bevorzugung Teilnahme und Huldigung entgegenzubringen" (33).

("Life and Works" 232; also 236; cf. Baron). Vacationing in Venice, Aschenbach again seizes the sensation of his same-sex attraction in order to add to his contributions to the literary canon. He thus invests in a sociocultural system that reinforces public opinion by integrating the most distinct and different as a standard to represent conventional beliefs (see Lorey/Plews, esp. xiv-xviii). Aschenbach secures an esteemed position by a strategy of "prudent passion" ("besonnene Leidenschaft" 53) or of what the narrator refers to as "that cool professional approval" ("jener fachmännisch kühlen Billigung" 37). That is, Aschenbach's literary success is preconditioned by his being queerly physiognomically sensitive and at the same time by contributing to the system that demands he control his feelings and not admit the queer underpinning of culture. Aschenbach – like the real-life Winckelmann before him – sustains the fantasy of a homosexual interest *in* men but diverts the notion of acting out that desire in reality in a physical or flagrant manner by subordinating it to serve the interests *of* men, by providing the graceful ideal image of their apparent physical and intellectual superiority. In short, Tadzio's physiognomy is a blueprint of Aschenbach's success in a conventional world.

By studying Aschenbach's practice of physiognomy – his way of willfully reading faces to secure his cultural standing – it is possible to see the underlying paradox in the culture-producing echelons of Aschenbach's society that requires a successful member at once to suppress and to embrace aspects of same-sex sexuality. Just as the connotations associated with the sequence of grotesque 'foreign' figures reveal the common denominator of a sexuality from which Aschenbach tends to recoil, the connotations associated with the classicized/Germanized Tadzio likewise turn out to have a sexual undercurrent but one that is seen to make a positive contribution to the culture that Aschenbach supports as a writer.[41] Aschenbach's physiognomizing thus shows the protagonist to have taken a position in the debate on homosexual emancipation. On the one hand, Aschenbach shows contempt for, and distances himself from, the types he deems threateningly foreign yet who resemble the sexual invert or third sex as proposed by Ulrichs and, later, by Hirschfeld and his Wissenschaftlichhumanitäres Komitee (Scientific-Humanitarian Committee). On the other hand, the way in which Aschenbach praises, and argues his pursuit of, the acculturated Tadzio aligns the author-figure with the perspective of such men as Adolf Brand and Benedict Friedländer. These founding members of the rival Gemeinschaft der Eigenen (Community of the Special) rejected the congenital third-sex model and the rights movement that had built up around it. They considered themselves 'bisexual homosexuals' and advocated Hellenic man-boy erotic (i.e., nonsexual) relations between males, believing that such pedophile relations were conducive to the construction of the political state and aesthetically superior to either homosexual or heterosexual relations (see Steakley, *Homosexual Emancipation* 43-44, 46, 54, 61). This difference in opinion – and the disturbing distraction the third-sex homosexual represents to the proponents of the apparently more culturally superior Hellenic model – is intimated early on in *Death in Venice* when Aschenbach's pedantic interest in the Greek inscriptions in the cemetery is interrupted by the 'new direction of thought' spurred by the appearance of the 'unusual' man in the portico. While physiognomy helps Aschenbach to regulate his encounters with men, its analysis reveals a duality in the proscription upon homosexuality that the protagonist may exploit. Aschenbach's sense of his own cultural superiority precludes him from engaging sexually with men close to his age. Yet it requires him or gives him a certain leeway to recognize the homoerotic appeal of the younger male and so allow his interest *in* men to be co-opted in the service of the interests *of* men.[42]

---

[41] Cf. Reed who argues – by referring to Mann's knowledge of the purely sexual and the higher cultural uses of homosexuality conceived by Plato – that Aschenbach is stalled at the sexual level, idolizing Tadzio as opposed to turning him into divine thought (*Text* 160-62; *Uses* 156-75).

A consideration of the presence of physiognomy in the text also shows the narrator practicing physiognomy on Aschenbach in the same Lavaterian way as Aschenbach regards others. The narrator provides a sizeable description of Aschenbach's face:

---

[42] Oosterhuis discusses Mann's linking of homoeroticism and the German nation in the essays *Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen* (*Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*, 1918) and *Von deutscher Republik* (*On the German Republic*, 1922) (1998, esp. 189-92, 194). Oosterhuis indicates that, while Mann was little interested in homosexual emancipation and rejected Hirschfeld's position, his – initial – political understanding of homoeroticism and the tradition of male-male associations in German culture meant his views approximated those of Brand and archconservative intellectual Hans Blüher (see also Detering 285-90; Feuerlicht 93). I am also struck by the proximity between Mann's and Friedländer's thought after reading the following remarks by Ritter about the essay *Über die Ehe* (*On Marriage*, 1925): "Mann equated 'virtue and morality' with heterosexual marriage, and 'aestheticism' with homosexual artists. He seemed to see in gay [*sic*] love only a narcissistic death wish. Yet, confusingly enough, he also insisted in his diaries that *his* particular 'abstract' homoerotic desire represented a healthier instinct than his far more powerful drive for a bourgeois family" ("A Critical History" 91-92). While Heilbut perhaps goes a little far in asserting that Mann speaks "for homosexuals" (251), it certainly appears that Aschenbach is accompanied by Mann in sharing Brand and Friedländer's viewpoint. Feuerlicht has well catalogued Mann's sustained interest in adolescent males and young men (91-92).

> Gustav von Aschenbach was a little below average height, dark-haired, and clean-shaven. His head seemed a little too big in proportion to his almost delicate figure. His brushed-back hair, thinning at the parting, considerably bushy and gray at the temples, framed a high, deeply lined, and – as it were – scarred forehead. The bow of a pair of gold spectacles with rimless lenses cut into the base of his thickset, nobly curved nose. His mouth was large, often slack, often suddenly narrow and tense. His cheeks were lean and furrowed. His well-built chin was slightly cleft. Significant events seemed to have passed over this head that generally leaned to the side and had an air of suffering. And yet it was art that had here taken over the role of molding the features of the face that is otherwise the work of a hard and active life. Behind this brow were born the lightening repartee of the dialogue between Voltaire and Frederick the Great on the subject of war; these eyes, peering tiredly and deeply through their spectacles, had seen the bloody inferno of the military hospitals of the Seven Years War. Also speaking personally, art is even an enhanced life. It satisfies more deeply and consumes more quickly. It engraves in the countenance of its servant the traces of imaginary and spiritual adventures, and over a length of time produces – even should that servant outwardly exist in monastic seclusion – a finicality, overrefinement, weariness, and hyperstimulation, such as a life full of the most excessive passions and pleasures is hardly able to bring forth.[43]

---

[43] "Gustav von Aschenbach war ein wenig unter Mittelgröße, brünett, rasiert. Sein Kopf erschien ein wenig zu groß im Verhältnis zu der fast zierlichen Gestalt. Sein rückwärts gebürstetes Haar, am Scheitel gelichtet, an den Schläfen sehr voll und stark ergraut, umrahmte eine hohe, zerklüftete und gleichsam narbige Stirn. Der Bügel einer Goldbrille mit randlosen Gläsern schnitt in die Wurzel der gedrungenen, edel gebogenen Nase ein. Der Mund war groß, oft schlaff, oft plötzlich schmal und gespannt; die Wangenpartie mager und gefurcht, das wohlausgebildete Kinn weich gespalten. Bedeutende Schicksale schienen über dies meist leidend seitwärts geneigte Haupt hinweggegangen zu sein, und doch war die Kunst es gewesen, die hier jene physiognomische Durchbildung übernommen hatte, welche sonst das Werk eines schweren, bewegten Lebens ist. Hinter dieser Stirn waren die blitzenden Repliken des Gesprächs zwischen Voltaire und dem Könige über den Krieg geboren; diese Augen, müde und tief durch die Gläser blickend, hatten das blutige Inferno der Lazarette des Siebenjährigen Krieges gesehen. Auch persönlich genommen ist ja die Kunst ein erhöhtes Leben. Sie beglückt tiefer, sie verzehrt rascher. Sie gräbt in das Antlitz ihres Dieners die Spuren imaginärer und geistiger Abenteuer, und sie erzeugt, selbst bei köstlicher Stille des äußeren Daseins, auf die Dauer eine Verwöhntheit, Überfeinerung, Müdigkeit und Neugier der Nerven, wie ein Leben voll ausschweifendster Leidenschaften und

Elsewhere in the text, Aschenbach is said to have gray hair, a "tired and sharp face," and a "high forehead"[44] and simply to look "serious" (40; twice sharing this expression with Tadzio: 60, 73). When discussing encounters between Aschenbach and Tadzio, the narrator refers not only to "that cool professional approval," but also to "the educated and dignified expression of the elder."[45] Having identified Aschenbach from the outset as a *writer*, the novella-narrator gives meaning to the arbitrary components of this fellow cultural producer's face by insisting that as a whole his features bear witness to his occupation as a *servant to art*. In the narrator's opinion, "art is an enhanced life" that causes both deep happiness and rapid debilitation in the producer. By thus correlating Aschenbach's face with the preconceived function of the artist as someone who *suffers for the cause*, the narrator confirms the knowledge of the protagonist's nature. Aschenbach's temples and high forehead, his aristocratic nose, his grooved cheeks, and his manly chin are lent signification by the inflection of strenuous effort, experience, and dedication and so testify that Aschenbach is 'finicky,' 'overrefined,' 'weary,' 'hyperstimulated,' but also 'educated' and 'dignified' by nature.

However, a close examination of the narrator's description of Aschenbach reveals an unflattering portrayal. While there are some positive terms ("gold," "nobly curved," "well-built"), the narrator makes greater use of expressions that are commonly considered negative and that suggest the author-figure is both undersized ("below average," "delicate, "narrow," "lean") and oversized ("too big," "high," "thickset," "large"), worn ("thinning," "gray," "slack," "tiredly and deeply," "tired"), cracked ("deeply lined," "scarred," "cut," "furrowed," "cleft"), stiff ("tense," "serious"), off balance ("leaned to the side"), and angular ("sharp"). D. J. Farrelly chalks Aschenbach's facial dichotomy up to the close, yet antagonistic, relationship of Apollo and Dionysus (5). Von Matt interprets the sideward tilt of Aschenbach's head as an allusion to the pose of Christ suffering on the cross and thus an

---

Genüsse sie kaum hervorbringen vermag" (19-20).

[44] "sein graues Haar, sein müdes und scharfes Gesicht" (42); "dem grauhaarigen, hochgestirnten Mann" (45); "der Grauhaarige" (73).

[45] "jener fachmännisch kühlen Billigung," (37); "d[ie] gebildete[] und würdevolle[] Miene des Älteren" (60).

indication of the artist's role as "the only authentic martyr of bourgeois society, the secularized saint" (197-98). But Aschenbach's delapidated hatchet face on a big head leaning to one side has a far greater kinship with the unusual fellows whom he regards so negatively (see also Rockwood/Rockwood 138; Tobin, "Life and Works" 228). The narrator's positive verdict on Aschenbach as the exhausted aesthete is clearly as willful as any of the physiognomical assessments Aschenbach makes of the men he encounters. In fact, as Arthur Burkhard has shown, Mann tends to cast artist-figures as people who are recognizably "not normal," (881) as "dubious, disreputable, questionable or genuinely suspicious characters" (883) who "all lead, for some reason or other, a life made difficult in consequence, with 'something always to conceal or to defend'" (886). Burkhard notices resemblances between "These isolated, branded, marked men" (890); that they have "awkward bodies" (892), a "lack of masculinity" (895), and symbolically "queer" names (896, 897). E. L. Marson suggests that Aschenbach's physiognomy, marked by 'excessive passion,' recalls the "classic picture of the legendary physical effects of onanism" (20; see also 20n17). In *Death in Venice*, the emphasis on Aschenbach's educated writer's looks is deceptive, for all along he bears the signs of the third-sex homosexual deemed incompatible with the (bourgeois) projects of nation and culture. The narrator uses the image of the exhausted aesthete to mask someone who underneath is a tired old queen.

Just as reviewing the faces that Aschenbach observes reveals how he manipulates them in order to maintain his esteemed position in society, so too does the narrator's description of Aschenbach serve as a site for analyzing not the protagonist, but the way the narrator negotiates his own cultural status. The narrator's decoding of Aschenbach's face is an encoding motivated by self-interest. It is a demonstration of the narrator's power and need to read a kindred spirit as positive no matter how that other person 'really' is or appears externally. For, instead of confirming a homosexual, the narrator appraises Aschenbach's physiognomy as that of an excessively diligent and long-suffering artist. The narrator benefits from such a strategy in two ways. First, as someone who shares the same vocation and initially many of the same cultural attitudes as Aschenbach (Cohn 126-27) and who is compelled to follow this celebrity's every step, the narrator's attempt to misconstrue the signs of homosexuality enables him to engage himself with the revered author-figure and so, by association, take advantage of his socially esteemed position without having any negative aspersions reflect back onto to him. Second, the narrator gains kudos by being seen to possess the ability to recognize the artistic greatness of an individual simply by inspecting that person's face. By imparting an artist's professional suffering from Aschenbach's delapidated features, Mann's narrator reaps the same reward as once did Lavater by appraising the positive nature of the poet from Goethe's apparent beauty.

However, the unflattering undertone to the narrator's description of Aschenbach recalls not so much Lavater's praise of Goethe (whom Mann used as one of a number of models for Aschenbach[46]) as the less than glowing physiognomical assessment of Lavater that Goethe used to distance himself from the Swiss physiognomist (cf. Matt 81-82). The narrator hedges his bets in making an example of Aschenbach for the sake of his own position. As the story develops, Aschenbach's interest in Tadzio shifts ever more clearly from aesthetic to sexual, from Hellenic to homosexual, a fact – made explicit in Aschenbach's second dream (78-80) – that is contrary to bourgeois values and so compromises the protagonist's and, correspondingly, the narrator's social standing. As a result, Aschenbach's observation of Tadzio becomes less guarded (see J. Frey 191) and, likewise, his relation to the negative types changes from passive observer, to addressee, respondent, addresser, and, finally, confidant. Consequently, in order to maintain and demonstrate his dignified position, the narrator must reevaluate and recast his relation to the protagonist from one of proximity to one of distance. So long as Aschenbach avoids men such as the one in the portico and pays only professional attention to the boy, the narrator maintains his association for it is to his own advantage to be in such company. But he becomes ever more detached from the protagonist as soon as Aschenbach gives up his charade. Dorrit Cohn has traced the narrator's use of ever more negative nomenclature for Aschenbach and a gradual divergence both in aesthetic and in moral stances between the narrator and the protagonist as ways in which the narrator begins to separate himself from the author-figure (esp. 125-26, 129; see also Pike 136; Reed, *Uses* 148, 163). Physiognomy is another such strategy. After willfully seeing only commendable self-sacrifice in Aschenbach's face – a perspective from which the narrator benefits by association – the narrator later reencodes the protagonist by sending him for a physiognomical makeover at the hotel barber's. This maneuver removes Aschenbach's educated physiognomy and so further emphasizes the growing distance between the straying protagonist and the 'reliable' narrator. We are told that Aschenbach attends to his outward appearance because those physical characteristics so indicative of the 'educated and dignified nature of the writer and servant to art' – the ageing body, gray hair, and sharp features – revolt him and make him feel ashamed and hopeless (80-81). The barber repairs Aschenbach's "negligence" ("Vernachlässigung") by dyeing his gray hair black again (81) and applying makeup: "Aschenbach ... saw his eyebrows arch more resolutely and more symmetrically, the contour of his eyes extend and their brilliance enhance with a slight application below the lids. He saw lower down, where the skin had been leathery brown, a soft crimson gently applied and aroused, his once bloodless lips swell with the color of raspberries, the lines on his cheeks and around his mouth and eyes disappear under foundation and the breath of youth – with his heart pounding he saw a glowing youth."[47]

---

[46] Other models include French novelist Gustave Flaubert, composers Gustav Mahler and Richard Wagner, philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, and poet August von Platen. For allusions to Platen in Aschenbach, see Oppenheimer (146-52).

In their recent article on the language of fashion in Thomas Mann's works, Holger Pausch and Diana Spokiene interpret the made-up Aschenbach as a lovesick attempt at rejuvenation or an effort to appeal to a younger generation by getting with the fashion (96-98), a move that presumably only makes the author-figure out to be yet another fashion victim who is reluctant to accept the transitoriness of his own existence (cf. 91, 99).[48] Yet this interpretation is only part of the story. For makeup is not only an article of the modern fashion discourse, it is a weapon in the arsenal of physiognomy. Makeup enables warriors to appear more fearsome, actors or clowns to belabor their tragedy, and women to accentuate their features. So too does Aschenbach's makeover only reveal him to be threatening, tragic, and effeminate. The makeover emphasizes Aschenbach's queerness; the apparent coverup uncovers him. While correctly pointing out that Aschenbach's sartorial and cosmetic metamorphosis is anticipated in the style of the old dandy clerk (97), Pausch and Spokiene do not address the fact that, despite the deflection of the narrator's initial positive assessment, the language-system of Aschenbach's own physical features has all along shown the author-figure to have something in common with the types he regards so negatively. As Margaret Gullette accurately points out, Aschenbach must be pretty ugly as no-one seems to be particularly attracted to him (223). The change that overcomes Aschenbach is no change at all; it is a shift in the strategy of the narrator. The narrator's first description of Aschenbach is the coverup; his final one is a mean-spirited, self-interested outing, which Aschenbach is forced to watch face-to-face in the mirror. Rather than covering up Aschenbach's mortality, the trip to the barber's only exaggerates the protagonist's ugliness and proximity to the negative grotesque types. It extends the distance between the soul-searching protagonist and the narrator eager to maintain his narrative control and cultural authority. Just as Aschenbach had once distanced himself from homosexuals by painting them as foreigners and turning away, the narrator now ensures that his previous proximity to the protagonist that abetted the narrator's position is revised. Now the narrator can gain in prestige by turning away from Aschenbach. By the same strokes as Aschenbach once used – and as echoed by the baritone guitarist's initial encroachment upon his audience and then reestablishment of the artistic distance between them[49] – the narrator puts a new face on Aschenbach – that of a foreigner and queer – to establish some distance between him and the now supposedly disgraced author-figure. What has been intimated yet excused throughout the novel is now pointedly emphasized by Mann's narrator: Aschenbach is exactly the type of man whom a cultural producer such as the narrator knows demonstrably to avoid in order to be successful. And who is to say that the narrator has not known this all along, for, after close examination of the narrator's physiognomizing, is it not clear that the narrator first sets up Aschenbach in order to promote himself and then turns on Aschenbach, betrays his central character, in order to supersede him. Burton Pike maintains that "Aschenbach is diminished so that the narrator may triumph" (137), but perhaps we should slightly modify this assertion: Aschenbach ***undergoes diminution*** so that the narrator may triumph.

---

[47] "Aschenbach ... sah ... seine Brauen sich entschiedener und ebenmäßiger wölben, den Schnitt seiner Augen sich verlängern, ihren Glanz durch eine leichte Untermalung des Lides sich heben, sah weiter unten, wo die Haut bräunlich-ledern gewesen, weich aufgetragen, ein zartes Karmin erwachen, seine Lippen, blutarm soeben noch, himbeerfarben schwellen, die Furchen der Wangen, des Mundes, die Runzeln der Augen unter Crème und Jugendhauch verschwinden, – erblickte mit Herzklopfen einen blühenden Jüngling" (81-82).

[48] Gullette makes more or less the same point in her discussion of the "protagonist's illusory attempt to circumvent his ageing ... by trying to possess youth vicariously through the bodies of the young" (215). See also Swales (*Thomas Mann* 41). Zmegač sees Thomas Mann's use of makeup in the context of Charles Baudelaire's antithesis between nature (the imitation of nature) and the civilizing process of cultural artifice (164).

---

[49] "Die Aufhebung der physischen Distanz zwischen dem Komödianten und den Anständigen" (71); "bei wiederhergestelltem künstlerischen Abstand zwischen ihm und den Herrschaften" (72).

No longer projecting the social and moral standard, indeed, finally only erasing that standard with a makeover, Aschenbach is forced to show his other side, a same-sex interest that, almost as immediately as it reveals itself, brings an end to his esteemed place in society: the announcement of his death is received by the world the same day. This and more: Tadzio, revealed as the project of homosexual desire, has his face rubbed in the sand by his former friend and stereotypically more masculine Jaschu, only finally to reemerge in Aschenbach's eyes as Hermes, the Hellenic symbol of creativity (86-87). The lesson is clear: Thomas Mann's text maintains that certain queer drives and desires, while essential to cultural production, are at once incompatible with social and intellectual success, that not just their deflection or camouflaging, but their entire sustained repression is necessary if one wishes to maintain one's standing in the public eye and to be economically viable as an intellectual, canonical author, and national treasure. Mann uses physiognomy – the reasoning of the attraction of some faces and of the repulsion of others – to demonstrate the double bind informing cultural production in the modern age. That bind is a homosocial imperative concerning the concomitant homoerotic underpinning of art discourse and the homophobic economy of symbolic recognition. Mann's novella warns of the grave consequences of failing to contain within art musings one's interest in men within the interests of men. It warns cultural producers of the discriminatory dynamics of the cultural field and of their part in maintaining that discrimination. As Russell A. Berman points out, the narrator ignores Aschenbach's ultimate ethical choice "to refrain from acting on a desire incompatible with social norms" ("History and Community" 275). Because of this, Berman maintains that "the text demonstrates the inappropriateness of the narrator's evaluation of the writer" and that secondary literature's "evaluation of Aschenbach's death, the final scene on the beach, urgently needs reconsideration" ("History and Community" 275). Indeed, Aschenbach dies of cholera, from eating tainted strawberries, an erotic symbol if there ever was one; he does not die of moral decay (at most, he has stepped in as a cryptoincestuous father-figure). But more to the point, Aschenbach is extinguished by a physiognomizing narrator, driven to secure his own place in the symbolic economy of culture, and making use of a system of outing and belittling others that Mann has used extensively elsewhere in his early works (see Diller). While Berman talks of the "defeat ... of the authoritarian narrator, who emerges as deeply mistaken in his moralizing judgment" ("History and Community" 276), one cannot help wonder whether that moral defeat translates into success and celebrity for the narrator. One cannot help speculate on whether Thomas Mann holds up *Death in Venice* as a mirror to his peers to make them countenance the repressive and contradictory dynamics of cultural production and cultural recognition of the time. One wonders whether Mann's text is itself a physiognomy – at once a mask and uncovering – an outward representation of the internal social-sexual struggles and cultural complicity of a certain revered author Thomas Mann.

Conclusion

Recent critics have tended to assign Johann Caspar Lavater's *Physiognomical Fragments* to a particular place within the history of physiognomy in accordance with Michel Foucault's archaeological study of the human sciences. My work has not sought to depart from this trend. Yet, I believe that others' attempts have generally overlooked the all-important transitions between discontinuities in the structure of thought, or the cusp of one episteme that prepares the way for the next. It is within just such a cusp, that of the classical episteme as it shifts to the modern episteme, that I maintain Lavater's *Fragments* are to be located. While Lavater's collection of physiognomical signs are still intent on classification, they differ from those most typical of the classical episteme and tend toward those of modernity for they rely less on external physical structures than on abstract social relations for the grounds of their representation. Also, they are concerned less with the facial verification of virtue or vice than with the distinction and display of all knowable types. This clarification of Lavater's position is necessary not merely in order to set the Swiss physiognomist apart from those who preceded him and those who have followed. Rather, such relocating helps us understand how and why the face as an external structure, a sign of character, and representation persisted into modernity. Such a positioning of Lavater's method emphasizes that the essential components of his work require the prejudice of identity. It is the widely considered function of a particular identity that informs the meaning attached to a face that then together as signified and signifier form the physiognomical sign. Through Lavater's eyes, physiognomy began to reflect less the imposition of a system of manners for a civil society and more the need for an information technology supposedly to ascertain the incontrovertible position of all people in society. As Georg Christoph Lichtenberg notes in his criticism of physiognomists, Lavaterian physiognomy moves from prophecy to self-fulfilling prophecy (see also Gray, "Sign and *Sein*" esp. 310-11). By already assuming the function of an identity and attaching that function to the face – as the a priori specter of the face – in a table of faces among other tables of faces, Lavater was able to effect the knowledge of an order of human beings that directly corroborated the structure of society more or less as it appeared to him. Richard Gray remarks on the coincidence of a rationalized taxonomical structure of thought and the rise of a bourgeoisie concerned with its own authority and definition. Gray states: "We must keep in mind that the resurgence of physiognomics in the final three decades of the eighteenth century in [Switzerland and] Germany coincides not only with the rationalization of knowledge, its taxonomical segmentation into disciplinary divisions, but also with the solidification of bourgeois ideology into a powerful mechanism of sociocultural – if in Germany not yet political – mastery. It is this intermeshing of physiognomics with the ideological process of bourgeois self-definition which largely accounts for those innovations that distinguish bourgeois physiognomical theory from its historical antecedents" ("Sign and *Sein*" 303). However, Lavater's discourse of physiognomical knowledge reserves the most favorable physiognomical assessments and therefore the most important and privileged positions for those people whom he considered equally most endowed with physiognomical sentiment and thus adept at making physiognomical observations. Such people included – along with himself – the immediate associates of this male, German-speaking Swiss pastor and cultural producer. Indeed, Lavater's treatises are a system of social control that brings the entire population under physiognomical surveillance in order not simply to reassure the bourgeoisie, but ultimately to issue positions of symbolic power and influence especially to the species of cultural producers.

The intention of my work has not been merely to produce an archaeology of physiognomy. Rather, I have gone on to focus on that group that has stood the most to gain from Lavaterian physiognomy, artist-intellectuals, and their relation to the physiognomical sign. I have examined whether and how they have incorporated this technology into their treatment of like cultural producers in their own cultural products and specifically the novel. From its beginnings in the eighteenth century, the novel has embraced as one of the principal manifestations of the genre a series of novels or subgenre – the Bildungs- and Künstlerroman – that specifically discusses the possibility of the formation of the artist-figure and his(/her) integration into (bourgeois) society. Especially these novels have served as the venue for a continued dialogue with physiognomy, a discursive system whose ulterior motive is, like that of the novels, to determine and promote the artist-intellectual. Remarking on nineteenth-century European fiction, Graeme Tytler states that "often narrators and characters were endowed with physiognomical skills and vision such as to suggest that it had now become the norm for fictional protagonists to be physiognomists in the most positive sense of the term" (317). He goes on to say that "Physiognomy is incorporated 'uncritically' into the ... German novel" (318). While the success of some novels may be explained in part by the increased sense of contemporaneity and level of entertainment gained by including physiognomic details per se, it is to be expected that the success of some of the artist-figures depicted in those novels can surely be explained in part by their investment in a system that has their symbolic well-being at heart. Just as the material elements – the sketched portraits, silhouettes, and descriptive assessments – assembled by physiognomists are sites in which they at once claim the right to define others and establish the proof of their own symbolic authority, so it is that, once these elements are appropriated in novels as literary portraits and physiognomic descriptions of faces rendered by a physiognomically sensitive narrator, protagonist, or character, they necessarily provide that narrator, protagonist, or character with a powerful language-system with which they may with some authority claim to recognize and validate the respective nature and social position of other characters, including the artist-figure. However, some narrators, protagonists, or characters may prove to be a little too willing or eager to validate particular characters as artist-intellectuals. They may be seen to rely on criteria that is either too broad or too rigid. Or they may feel obliged – for reasons that are not immediate or have nothing to do with cultural production – not to promote or even confirm the artistic or intellectual appearance and status of still other characters who have otherwise demonstrated artistic potential. Indeed, since novels make no effort to guarantee that any person wishing to make physiognomical assertions should possess any particular physiognomical skill, that physiognomical observers will act in the best interests of the physiognomically observed, or that any observed person should correspond or adhere to what is said of them physiognomically, it cannot be said even as a general rule that the German novel has taken up physiognomy 'uncritically.'

An analysis of the use of physiognomy in German prose from the late eighteenth century to the early twentieth century reveals a casual dependency on this pseudoscience that on the whole queries the custom of locating the poet or artist by means of the face. For sure, a number of literary works demonstrate a partiality for physiognomy especially among members of the cultured classes, and they often betray the preoccupation with faces as a quest for a means by which to reveal to others the god-given naturalness of the superior cultural standing of the observer. While some writers appropriate physiognomy for its general currency, others proceed only with reservation or amusement. Still others show how the collusion between physiognomy and the intellectual class is entrenched and restrictive.

The works on which this dissertation has focused illustrate these various ways of participating in the post-Lavaterian discourse on physiognomy. Clearly, three of the four works are rich in descriptions of faces and profiles that play an important role in the characterization and progress of major figures, and all four contain distinct allusions to Lavater's writings and the discourse surrounding it. For example, Adelbert von Chamisso's use of the shadow in relation to identity-formation in *Peter Schlemihl* evokes Lavater's preference for silhouettes. Eduard Mörike's *Maler Nolten* refers at several points to the ideas and images of a number of physiognomists that include Lavater, Lichtenberg, Charles Le Brun, and William Hogarth. The title of Heinrich Drendorf's study and the humanist ideals that motivate Risach's collecting in Adalbert Stifter's *Der Nachsommer* both clearly recall Lavater's physiognomical project. Thomas Mann's *Death in Venice* not only uses a range of terms to refer to the face but also intimates that Lavater's theory of the divine language of the face is the same factor motivating the protagonist's interest in the human form. Furthermore, each of the four works instantiates the step from merely appropriating physiognomical ideas to implying or inviting a critical engagement with the use of that system to define the artist. These writers' texts may at first seem to forgo any questioning of the regulatory system of modern faces in order to show instead how that system is helpful to a man of culture. Yet they critique the grounds of physiognomy, and especially the physiognomical sign that maintains the face of the artist-intellectual, revealing that it is misleading, inaccurate, unfounded, and prejudicial.

Chamisso's *Peter Schlemihl*, Mörike's *Maler Nolten*, Stifter's *Der Nachsommer*, and Mann's *Death in Venice* indicate how physiognomical discourse has insidiously insinuated itself in society and has become intrinsic to the being of an artist. They reveal how it is inconceivable for anyone to be acknowledged as an artist-intellectual without possessing the approved mien of the artist and the apparent physiognomical ability with which to recognize substance and beauty or to shun deceit and degeneracy. They demonstrate how there is a collusion between providing knowledge of others by means of their faces and projecting one's own intellectual authority as part of a national cultural establishment. In *Peter Schlemihl*, Chamisso shows how the success of public figures unavoidably depends on keeping up an official physiognomical appearance that may have little to do with or that even masks one's real self. Should one behave out of turn – for example, by pursuing a desire that is contrary to the norm – thereby exposing one's real self, all one has to do is select another official appearance and one may be reintegrated into civil society. However, Chamisso indicates that such a course of action is soul-destroying and opts for his Schlemihl to come out from reductive physiognomy as who he really is. Similarly, Mörike's *Maler Nolten* subverts the physiognomical system by indicating that the bourgeois social hegemony can make an artist in its own image. Indeed, there is only one kind of person who can be recognized as an artist and that is preferably the middle-class, urban, heterosexual man who happens to best match the desirable male aesthetic ideal. All others are deemed by physiognomical readings as contrary to art in spite of their contributions to the production and promotion of art. In *Der Nachsommer*, Stifter reveals how physiognomical sensitivity is essential should one wish to become a recognizable artist and that it is just as important to learn such skills as to demonstrate any artistic talent. Yet he also suggests that established artist-intellectuals use physiognomy to manipulate willing members of the younger generation into carrying on their legacy. In Mann's *Death in Venice*, physiognomy is evoked to impose readings on others in order to help an artist maintain his position of celebrity and authority and avoid courting any questions about the company he keeps or any aspect of art standards he is required to maintain. But it also shows how physiognomy can be used by others to advance their own social circumstances by betraying those who appear to fail to complete the co-optation of a personal interest *in* men in the service of the cultural interests *of* men.

In none of these instances do physiognomical guises enable art or genuine artists ever to prosper. Peter Schlemihl sets himself free from physiognomical shade in order to pursue intellectual goals. Theobald Nolten dies without producing any art and as a parody of the art that opens the novella. Heinrich Drendorf becomes rich but as a minion of patriarchal convention. Finally, Gustav von Aschenbach leaves work unfinished as he is extinguished by an ambitious narrator. Consistently, the physiognomical outline of the artist-intellectual is confined by normative notions of class, race, gender, and especially sexuality – a set of circumstances that German-language prose criticizes as too counterproductive. Indeed, the physiognomical system of social control designed to secure artist-intellectuals an influential position in society leaves those cultural producers wondering whether they are ultimately the ones being controlled.

Bibliography

Adnes, André. "Chamisso et le mythe de l'ombre." *Chamisso. Actes des journées franco-allemandes des 30 et 31 mai 1981*. Sainte-Ménehould: Centre d'études argonnais, 1982. 141-48.

Aluf, Israel. *The Concept of Integration in the Works of Adalbert Stifter*. Diss. Brown, 1958.

André, Jacques. "Introduction." *Traité de physiognomonie*. Anon. Trans. Jacques André. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1981. 7-47.

Amann, Klaus. *Adalbert Stifters 'Nachsommer'. Studie zur didaktischen Struktur des Romans*. Vienna: Braumüller, 1977.

———. "Zwei Thesen zu Stifters 'Nachsommer.'" *Vierteljahresschrift des Adalbert Stifter Institut des Landes Oberösterreich* 31 (1982): 169-84.

Amory, Frederic. "The Classical Style of *Der Tod in Venedig*." *Modern Language Review* 59 (1964): 399-409.

Appel, Paul. *Die Schilderung der körperlichen Erscheinung des Menschen im deutschen Roman zwischen 1870 und 1900*. Gießen: Meyer, 1924.

Arenberg, Carol Rakita. "Chamisso: The Artist in Limbo." *The Double as an Initiation Rite: A Study of Chamisso, Hoffmann, Poe and Dostoevsky*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1979. 27-66.

Aspetsberger, Friedbert. "Der Groß-Sprecher Heinrich Drendorf. Zu Adalbert Stifters 'Nachsommer.'" *Vierteljahresschrift des Adalbert Stifter Institut des Landes Oberösterreich* 32 (1983): 179-219.

Atkins, Stuart. "*Peter Schlemihl* in Relation to the Popular Novel of the Romantic Period." *The Germanic Review* 21 (1946): 191-208.

Baatz, Willfried. *Photography. An Illustrated Historical Overview*. New York: Barron's, 1997.

Baeumer, Max L. "Winckelmanns Formulierung der klassischen Schönheit." *Monatshefte* 65 (1973): 61-75.

Bark, Joachim. "Anmerkungen." *Der Nachsommer. Eine Erzählung*. By Adalbert Stifter. [Munich:] Goldman, 1999. 708-14.

Baron, Frank. "Sensuality and Morality in Thomas Mann's *Tod in Venedig*." *Germanic Review* 45 (1970): 115-25.

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. Trans. Annette Lavers. New York: Hill and Wsang, 1995.

Barton, Tasmyn. *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomy and Medicine Under the Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.

Baumgartner, Ulrich. *Adelbert von Chamissos 'Peter Schlemihl'*. Leipzig: Huber, 1944.

Baxandall, Michael. *Shadows and Enlightenment*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Belgum, Kirsten L. "High Historicism and Narrative Restoration: The Seamless Interior of Adalbert Stifter's *Nachsommer*." *Germanic Review* 67 (1992): 15-25.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Illuminations*. Ed. and Introduction by Hannah Arendt. Trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken, 1969. 217-51.

Berger, Willy R. "Drei phantastische Erzählungen. Chamissos 'Peter Schlemihl,' E. T. A. Hoffmanns 'Die Abenteuer der Silvesternacht' und Gogols 'Die Nase.'" *Arcadia* 13 (1978): 106-38.

———. "Thomas Mann und die antike Literatur." *Thomas Mann und die Tradition*. Ed. Peter Pütz. Frankfurt/M: Athenäum, 1971. 52-100.

Berka, Sigrid. "Kindfrauen als Projektionsfiguren in Mörikes *Maler Nolten* und Wedekinds *Montretragödie*." *Goethes Mignon und ihre Schwestern: Interpretationen und Rezeption*. New York: Lang, 1993. 135-64.

Berlin, Jeffrey B., ed. *Approaches to Teaching Mann's* Death in Venice *and Other Short Stories*. New York: MLA, 1992.

Berman, Russell A. "The Authority of Address: Adalbert Stifter." *The Rise of the Modern German Novel. Crisis and Charisma*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986. 105-33.

———. "History and Community in *Death in Venice*." Ritter, *Thomas Mann* 263-80.

Blasberg, Cornelia. *Erschriebene Tradition. Adalbert Stifter oder das Erzählen im Zeichen verlorener Geschichten*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Rombach, 1998.

Biedrzynski, Richard. "Begierde des Schauens." *Johann Joachim Winckelmann 1768 / 1968*. Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1968. 41-49.

Böhm, Karl Werner. *Zwischen Selbstsucht und Verlangen. Thomas Mann und das Stigma Homosexualität. Untersuchungen zu Frühwerk und Jugend*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1991.

Böhme, Hartmut. "Der sprechende Leib. Die Semiotiken des Körpers am Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts und ihre hermetische Tradition." *Transfigurationen des Körpers. Spuren der Gewalt in der Geschichte*. Ed. Dietmar Kamper and Christoph Wulf. Berlin: Reimer, 1989. 144-81.

Bohnengel, Julia. "'Der wilde Athem der Natur.' Zur Friedrich/Loskine-Episode in Mörikes 'Maler Nolten.'" *"Der Sonnenblume gleich steht mein Gemüthe offen." Neue Studien zum Werk Eduard Mörikes (mit einer Bibliographie der Forschungsliteratur 1985-1995)*. Ed. Reiner Wild. St. Ingbert: Röhrig, 1997. 45-69.

Bollnow, Otto Friedrich. "Der 'Nachsommer' und der Bildungsgedanke des Biedermeier." *Beiträge zur Einheit von Bildung und Sprache im geistigen Sein. Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Ernst Otto*. Ed. Gerhard Haselbach and Günter Hartmann. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1957. 14-33.

Borchmeyer, Dieter. "Ideologie der Familie und ästhetische Gesellschaftskritik in Stifters *Nachsommer*." *Zeitschrift der deutschen Philologie* 99 (1980): 226-54.

———. "Stifters *Nachsommer*, eine restaurative Utopie?" *Poetica. Zeitschrift für Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft* 12 (1980): 59-82.

Bottéro, Jean. "Symtômes, signes, écritures." *Divination et rationalité*. Centre de Recherches comparées sur les Sociétés Anciennes. Paris: Seuil, 1974. 70-197.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Ed. and Introduction by Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Boutin, Anne. "Le thème de l'ombre dans *La merveilleuse histoire de Peter Schlemihl* de Chamisso." *Mythe, rite, symbole. 21 essais d'anthroplogie littéraire*. Ed. Georges Cesbron. Angers: Presses de l'Université d'Angers, 1984. 30-49.

Boyd, James. "Introduction." *Adelbert von Chamisso. 'Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte'*. Ed. James Boyd. Oxford: Blackwell, 1962. ix-xxxiv.

Brassaï, Gilberte. *Brassaï: Letters to My Parents*. Trans. Peter Laki and Barna Kantor. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Bräuning-Oktavio, Hermann, ed. *Silhouetten aus der Wertherzeit. Aus dem Nachlaß von Johann Heinrich Voß und Carl Schuberts Silhouettenbuch*. Darmstadt: Wittich, 1925.

Braverman, Albert and Larry David Nachman. "The Dialectic of Decadence. An Analysis of Thomas Mann's *Death in Venice*." *Germanic Review* 45 (1970): 289-98.

Breithaupt, Fritz. "The Ego-Effect of Money." *Rereading Romanticism*. Ed. Martha B.

Helfer. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000. 227-57.

Bridges, George. "The Problem of Pederastic Love in Thomas Mann's *Death in Venice* and Plato's *Phaedrus*." *Selecta. Journal of the pacific Northwest Council on Foreign Languages* 7 (1986): 39-46.

Brinkley, Edward S. "Fear of Form: Thomas Mann's *Dr Tod in Venedig*." *Monatshefte* 91 (1999): 2-27.

Brockhagen, Dörte. "Adelbert von Chamisso." *Literatur in der sozialen Bewegung. Aufsätze und Forschungsberichte zum 19. Jahrhundert*. Ed. Alberto Martino, Günter Häntzschel, and Georg Jäger. Tübingen: Niemayer, 1977. 373-423.

Brosse, Jacques. "A la recherche d'une ombre perdue." Preface. *Voyage autour du monde 1815-1818*. By Adalbert von Chamisso. Trans. Henri-Alexis Baatsch. Paris: Corti, 1991. 7-28.

Browning, Frank. *A Queer Geography. Journeys toward a Sexual Self*. New York: Noonday, 1996.

Bruford, Walter Horace. *The German Tradition of Self-Cultivation. 'Bildung' from Humboldt to Thomas Mann*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.

Buggert, Christoph. *Figur und Erzähler. Studie zum Wandel der Wirklichkeitsauffassung im Werk Adalbert Stifters*. Munich: Lerche, 1970.

Burkhard, Ignace. "Thomas Mann's Appraisal of the Poet." *PMLA* 46 (1931): 880-916.

Busch, Frank. *August Graf von Platen – Thomas Mann: Zeichen und Gefühle*. Munich: Fink, 1987.

Butler, Colin. "Hobson's Choice: A Note on *Peter Schlemihl*." *Monatshefte* 69 (1977): 5-16.

Butler, E[liza] M[arian]. *The Tyranny of Greece over Germany. A Study of the Influence*

Exercised by Greek Art and Poetry over the Great German Writers of the Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. Cambridge: University Press, 1935.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Cadieux, André. "The Jungle of Dionysus: The Self in Mann and Nietzsche." *Philosophy and Literature* 3 (1979): 53-63.

Campe, Rüdiger, and Manfred Schneider, eds. *Geschichten der Physiognomik: Text, Bild, Wissen*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Rombach, 1996.

Camper, Pierre. *Dissertation sur les variétes naturelles qui caracterise la physionomie des hommes des divers climats et des différens ages; suivie de Réflexions sur la Beauté; particulièrement sur celle de la Tête, avec une Manière nouvelle de dessiner toutes sortes de têtes avec la plus grande exactitude*. Paris, 1791.

Chabozy, Friedrich. *Über das Jugendleben Adelberts von Chamisso zur Beurtheilung der Dichtung 'Peter Schlemihl'*. Munich: Wolf, 1879.

Chamisso, Adelbert von. *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1980.

Chetwynd, Tom. *A Dictionary of Symbols*. London: Paladin, 1982.

Chevalier, Jean and Alain Gheerbrant. *A Dictionary of Symbols*. Trans. John Buchanan-Brown. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1994.

Cohen, Ed. "The Double Lives of Man: Narration and Identification in Late Nineteenth-Century Representations of Ec-centric Masculinities." *Cultural Politics at the 'Fin de Siècle'*. Ed. Sally Ledger and Scott McCracken. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 85-114.

Cohn, Dorrit. "The Second Author of *Der Tod in Venedig*." *Critical Essays on Thomas Mann*. Ed. Inta M. Ezergailis. Boston: Hall, 1988. 124-43.

Cooper, J. C. *An Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Traditional Symbols*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1978.

Coquio, Catherine. "Un Double qui court plus vite que son ombre ou l'Étrange histoire de Schlemihl et Chamisso." *Op Cit. Revue de littératures française et comparée* 5 (1995): 285-99.

Corin, A. L. "L'Ombre de Pierre le Malchanceux." *Revue des langues vivantes* 16 (1950): 330-56.

Cornon, Louis. *Types morphopsychologiques en littérature*. Illustré de 100 portraits. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1978.

Courtine, Jean-Jacques, and Claudine Haroche. *Histoire du visage. Exprimer et taire ses émotions. XVI*^{e} *– début XIX*^{e} *siècle*. Paris: Rivages, 1988.

Croce, Benedetto. "Peter Schlemihl." *Poesie und Nichtpoesie. Bemerkungen über die europäische Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Zurich: 1925. 105-10.

Cureau de la Chambre, Marin. *L'Art de connoistre les hommes*. Amsterdam: Jacques le Jeune, 1669.

Curtius, Ludwig. "Johann Joachim Winckelmann." *Johann Joachim Winckelmann 1768 / 1968*. Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1968. 5-19.

Danès, Jean-Pierre. "Peter Schlemihl et la signification de l'ombre." *Etudes Germaniques* 35 (1980): 444-48.

Degkwitz, Andreas. "Die pseudoaristotelischen 'Physiognomonica.'" Campe/Schneider 23-44.

Del Caro, Adrian. "Philosophizing and Poetic License in Mann's Early Fiction." Berlin 39-48.

Derks, Paul. *Die Schande der heiligen Päderastie. Homosexualität und Öffentlichkeit in der deutschen Literatur, 1750-1850*. Berlin: Rosa Winkel, 1990.

Derwin, Susan. "Body-Bildung in German Classicism." *The Play of the Self*. Ed. Ronald Bogue and Mihai I. Spariosu. Albany: SUNY, 1994. 251-68.

Detering, Heinrich. *Das offene Geheimnis. Zur literarischen Produktivität eines Tabus von Winckelmann bis zu Thomas Mann*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 1994.

Deuse, Werner. "'Besonders ein antikisierendes Kapitel scheint mir gelungen': Griechisches in *Der Tod in Venedig*." *"Heimsuchung und süßes Gift": Erotik und Poetik bei Thomas Mann*. Ed. Gerhard Härle. Frankfurt/M: Fischer, 1992. 41-62.

Dierks, Manfred. *Studien zu Mythos und Psychologie bei Thomas Mann*. Bern: Francke, 1972.

Diller, Edward. "The Grotesque Animal-Heroes of Thomas Mann's Early Works." *German Life and Letters* 20 (1967): 225-33.

Doppler, Alfred. "Stifter im Kontext der Biedermeiernovelle." *Adalbert Stifter. Dichter und Maler, Denkmalpfleger und Schulmann. Neue Zugänge zu seinem Werk*. Ed. Hartmut Laufhütte and Karl Möseneder. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996. 207-19.

Edelman, Lee. *Homographesis. Essays in Gay Literary and Cultural Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

———. "Tearooms and Sympathy, or, The Epistemology of the Water Closet." *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*. Ed. Henry Abelove, Michèle Aina Barale, and David M. Halperin. New York: Routledge, 1993. 553-74.

Eichendorff, Joseph Freiherr von. "Immermann, Rückert, Chamisso." *Geschichte der poetischen Literatur Deutschlands. Sämtliche Werke des Freiherrn Joseph von Eichendorff. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe*. Vol. 9. Ed. Hermann Kunisch. Regensburg: Habbel, 1970. 455-60.

Eilert, Heide. "Eduard Mörike: *Maler Nolten* (1832)." *Romane und Erzählungen zwischen Romantik und Realismus. Neue Interpretationen*. Ed. Paul Michael Lützeler. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1983. 165-82.

Farrelly, D. J. "Apollo and Dionysus Interpreted in Thomas Mann's *Der Tod in Venedig*." *New German Studies* 3 (1975): 1-15.

Feudel, Werner. *Adelbert von Chamisso. Leben und Werk*. Leipzig: Reclam, 1980.

Feuerlicht, Ignace. "Thomas Mann and Homoeroticism." *Germanic Review* 57 (1982): 89-97.

Fickert, Kurt. "Truth and Fiction in *Der Tod in Venedig*." *Germanic Notes* 21 (1990): 25-31.

Fink, Gonthier-Louis. "*Peter Schlemihl* et la tradition du conte romantique." *Recherches germaniques* 12 (1982): 24-54.

———. "Peter Schlemihl ou la démonisation de l'argent." *Chamisso. Actes des journées franco-allemandes des 30 et 31 mai 1981*. Sainte-Ménehould: Centre d'études argonnais, 1982. 123-32.

Fischer, Karl. *Eduard Mörikes Leben und Werke*. Berlin: Bock, 1901.

Fischer, Rotraut, and Gabriele Stumpp. "Das konstruierte Individuum. Zur Physiognomik Johann Kaspar Lavaters und Carl Gustav Carus'." *Transfigurationen des Körpers. Spuren der Gewalt in der Geschichte*. Ed. Dietmar Kamper and Christoph Wulf. Berlin: Reimer, 1989. 123-43.

Fish, Stanley E. "Interpreting the *Variorum*." *Critical Inquiry* 2 (1976): 465-85.

Flores, Ralph. The Lost Shadow of Peter Schlemihl." *German Quarterly* 47 (1974): 567-84.

Foster, John Burt Jr. "Why is Tadzio Polish? *Kultur* and Cultural Multiplicity in *Death in Venice*." Ritter, *Thomas Mann* 192-210.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1995.

———. *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*. Trans. Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1990.

———. *The Order of Things. An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage, 1994.

———. "What is an Author?" Trans. Josue V. Harari. *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*. Ed. Josue V. Harari. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Frank, Bernhard. "Mann's *Death in Venice*." *Explicator* 45.1 (1986): 31-32.

Freund, Winfried. *Adelbert von Chamisso: Peter Schlemihl. Geld und Geist. Ein bürgerlicher Bewußtseinsspiegel. Entstehung–Struktur–Rezeption–Didaktik*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1980.

Frey, John R. "'Die stumme Begegnung.' Beobachtungen zur Funktion des Blicks im *Tod in Venedig*." *German Quarterly* 41 (1968): 177-95.

Frey, Siegfried. "Lavater, Lichtenberg, and the Suggestive Power of the Human Face." Shookman, *Faces of Physiognomy* 64-103.

Frye, Wendell. "Preface." *Indian Summer*. By Adalbert Stifter. Trans. Wendell Frye. New York: Lang, 1985. 5.

Furst, Lilian R. "The Potential Deceptiveness of Reading in *Death in Venice*." Ritter, *Thomas Mann* 158-170.

Fuss, Diana. "Fashion and the Homospectatorial Look." *Critical Inquiry* 18 (1992): 713-37.

Geitner, Ursula. "Klartext. Zur Physiognomik Johann Caspar Lavaters." Campe/Schneider 357-85.

Gille, Klaus F. "Der Schatten des Peter Schlemihl." *Der Deutschunterricht* 39.1 (1987): 74-83.

Gillespie, Gerald. "Ritualism and Motivic Development in Adalbert Stifter's *Nachsommer*." *Neophilologus* 48 (1964): 312-22.

Gilman, Sander L. "Lavater, Lichtenberg, and the Physiognomy of the Black." *On Blackness without Blacks: Essays on the Image of the Black in Germany*. Boston: Hall, 1982. 49-56.

———. *Rasse, Sexualität und Seuche. Stereotype aus der Innenwelt der westlichen Kultur*. Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1992.

Giua, Alessandro. *The Iconography of Saint Sebastian*. 3 May 2000 <http://bode.diee.unica.it/~giua/SEBASTIAN/St.Sebastian.html>.

Gladiator, El. *El Museo del Gayo*. 3 May 2000 <http://www.gladiador.simplenet.com/museo/index.html>.

Glaser, Horst Albert. *Die Restauration des Schönen. Stifters "Nachsommer."* Stuttgart: Metzler, 1965.

Gleason, Maud W. *Making Men. Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Gockel, Heinz. "Aschenbachs Tod in Venedig." *Erzählungen und Novellen*. Ed. Rudolf Wolff. Bonn: Bouvier, 1984. 27-41.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1985.

———. "Winckelmann und sein Jahrhundert." *Gedenkausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche*. Ed. Ernst Beutler. Zurich: Artemis, 1965. 13: 407-50.

Graevenitz, Gerhart von. *Eduard Mörike: Die Kunst der Sünde. Zur Geschichte des literarischen Individuums*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1978.

Graham, John. "Contexts of Physiognomic Description: *Ut Pictura Poesis*." Shookman, *Faces of Physiognomy* 139-43.

———. *Lavater's Essays on Physiognomy: A Study in the History of Ideas*. Bern: Lang, 1979.

Gramsci, Antonio. "The Intellectual." *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Ed. and trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International, 1971. 3-23.

Gray, Richard. "Die Geburt des Genies aus dem Geiste der Aufklärung. Semiotik und Aufklärungsidologie in der Physiognomik Johann Kaspar Lavaters." *Poetica. Zeitschrift für Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft* 23 (1991): 95-138.

———."Sign and *Sein*. The *Physiognomikstreit* and the Dispute over the Semiotic Constitution of Bourgeois Individuality." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literatur und Geisteswissenschaft* 66 (1992): 300-32.

Grimm, Erk. "Vorspiel zum Glück: Heinrich Drendorfs Nachsommer." *Vierteljahresschrift des Adalbert Stifter Institut des Landes Oberösterreich* 39.3-4 (1990): 25-39.

Groddeck, Wolfram, and Ulrich Stadler, eds. *Physiognomie und Pathognomie. Zur literarischen Darstellung von Individualität. Festschrift für Karl Pestalozzi zum 65. Geburtstag*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994.

Gronicka, André von. "'Myth plus Psychology.' A Style Analysis of *Death in Venice*." *Germanic Review* 31 (1956): 191-205.

Guinaudeau, Oliver. "Les rapports de Goethe et de Lavater." *Études Germaniques* 4 (1949): 213-26.

Gullette, Margaret Morganroth. "The Exile of Adulthood: Pedophilia in the Midlife Novel." *Novel. A Forum on Fiction* 17.3 (1984): 215-32.

Gustafson, Lorraine. Xenophon and *Der Tod in Venedig*." *Germanic Review* 21 (1946): 209-14.

Gutting, Gary. *Michel Foucault's Archaeology of Scientific Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Hallamore, G[ertrude] Joyce. "The Symbolism of the Marble Muse in Stifter's *Nachsommer*." *PMLA* 74 (1959): 398-405.

Hankamer, Paul. "Die Menschenwelt in Stifters Werk." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literatur und Geistesgeschichte* 16 (1938): 95-125.

Hartwig, Ina. "Noten zu Homosexualität." *Merkur* 49 (1995): 904-14.

Hausdörfer, Sabrina. "Späte Blendung – Eduard Mörikes 'Maler Nolten.' *Rebellion im Kunstschein. Die Funktion des fiktiven Künstlers in Roman und Kunsttheorie der deutschen Romantik*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1987. 241-64.

Hayes, Tom and Lee Quinby. "The Aporia of Bourgeois Art: Desire in Thomas Mann's *Death in Venice*." *Criticism* 31 (1989): 159-77.

Heier, E[dmund]. "'The Literary Portrait' as a Device of Characterization." *Neophilologus* 60 (1976): 321-33.

Heilbut, Anthony. *Thomas Mann. Eros and Literature*. New York: Knopf, 1996.

Heinisch, Klaus J. "Adelbert von Chamisso: *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte* (1813)." *Deutsche Romantik. Interpretationen*. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1966. 36-49.

Heller, Erich. *Thomas Mann: The Ironic German. A Study*. Cleveland: Meridian, 1961.

Hergemöller, Bernd-Ulrich. "Randgruppen der spätmittelalterlichen Gesellschaft – Einheit und Vielfalt." *Randgruppen der spätmittelalterlichen Gesellschaft. Ein Hand- und Studienbuch*. Ed. Bernd-Ulrich Hergemöller. Warendorf: Fahlbusch, 1990. 1-51.

Heydebrand, Renate. *Eduard Mörikes Gedichtwerk. Beschreibung und Deutung der Formenvielfalt und ihrer Entwicklung*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1972.

Hickman, Peggy. *Silhouettes. A Living Art*. Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1975.

Higgins, Patrick, ed. *A Queer Reader*. London: Fourth Estate, 1993.

Hitzig, Eduard Julius, ed. *Leben und Briefe von Adelbert von Chamisso. Adelbert von Chamissos Werke*. Vols. 5-6. Leipzig: Weidmann'sche, 1839.

Hoffmann, E[rnst]. T[heodor]. A[madeus]. *Lebens-Ansichten des Katers Murr, nebst fragmentarischer Biographie des Kapellmeisters Johannes Kreisler in zufälligen Makulaturblättern*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1986.

Hoffmann, Ernst Fedor. "Spiegelbild und Schatten. Zur Behandluung ähnlicher Motive bei Brentano, Hoffmann und Chamisso." *Lebendige Form: Interpretationen zur deutschen Literatur. Festschrift für Heinrich E. K. Henel*. Ed. Jeffrey L. Sammons and Ernst Schürer. Munich: Fink, 1970. 167-88.

Hoffmann, Volker. "Nachwort." *Adelbert von Chamisso. Sämtliche Werke in 2 Bänden*. Vol. 2. Munich: Winkler, 1975. 665-99.

Hohendahl, Peter Uwe. "Die gebildete Gemeinschaft: Stifters *Nachsommer* als Utopie der ästhetischen Erziehung." *Utopieforschung: Interdisziplinäre Studien zur neuzeitlichen Utopie*. Ed. Wilhelm Voßkamp. Vol. 3. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1982. 333-56.

Hohoff, Curt. “Adelbert von Chamisso.” *Das innere Reich* 7 (1940/41): 448-60.

Holthausen, Hans Egon. *Eduard Mörike*. Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1971.

✓ Honour, Hugh. *Neo-classicism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968.

Hörisch, Jochen. *Kopf und Zahl. Die Poesie des Geldes*. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp, 1996.

Hornblower, Simon and Antony Spawforth. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Third Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Horstmann, Isabel. *Eduard Mörikes ‘Maler Nolten’. Biedermeier: Idylle und Abgrund*. Frankfurt/M: Lang, 1996.

Immerwahr, Raymond. “The Loves of Maler Nolten.” *Rice University Studies* 57 (1971): 73-87.

———. “Mörike’s *Maler Nolten* as a Romantic Novel: The Problem of Unity.” *Echoes and Influences of German Romanticism. Essya in Honour of Hans Eichner*. Ed. Michael S. Batts, Anthony W. Riley, and Heinz Wetzel. New York: Lang, 1987. 63-83.

Iser, Wolfgang. *Der Akt des Lesens. Theorie ästhetischer Wirkung*. Munich: Fink, 1976.

———. *Der implizite Leser; Kommunikationsformen des Romans von Bunyan bis Beckett*. Munich: Fink, 1972.

———. “The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach.” *New Literary History* 3 (1972): 279-99.

Jacobs, Jürgen. *Wilhelm Meister und seine Brüder. Untersuchungen zum deutschen Bildungsroman*. Munich: Beck, 1972.

——— and Markus Krause. *Der deutsche Bildungsroman. Gattungsgeschichte vom 18. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert*. Munich: Beck, 1989.

Jennings, Lee B. "Mörike's Grotesquery: A Post-Romantic Phenomenon." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 59 (1960): 600-16.

———. "Suckelborst, Wispel, and Mörike's Mythopoeia." *Euphorion* 65 (1971): 320-32.

Jofen, Jean. "A Freudian Commentary on Thomas Mann's *Death in Venice*." *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology* 6 (1985): 238-47.

Jones, James W. *"We of the Third Sex": Literary Representations of Homosexuality in Wilhelmine Germany*. New York: Lang, 1990.

Kapp, Friedrich. *Die Achtundvierziger in den Vereinigten Staaten. Demokratische Studien*. Ed. Ludwig Walesrode. Hamburg: 1861.

Käuser, Andreas. *Physiognomik und Roman im 18. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt/M: Lang, 1989.

Keller, Thomas. *Die Schrift in Stifters 'Nachsommer'. Buchstäblichkeit und Bildlichkeit des Romantextes*. Cologne: Böhlau, 1982.

Kelley, Alice van Buren. "Von Aschenbach's *Phaedrus*: Platonic Allusion in *Der Tod in Venedig*." *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 75 (1976): 228-40.

Kern, Franz. "Chamissos Faust und Peter Schlemihl." *Vossische Zeitung*. Sonntagsbeilage 49. 1886.

Killy, Walther. "Utopische Gegenwart. Stifters *Nachsommer*. (1856)." *Wirklichkeit und Kunstcharakter. Neun Romane des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Munich: Beck, 1963. 83-103, 229.

Kläui, Elisabeth. *Gestaltung und Formen der Zeit im Werk Adalbert Stifters*. Bern: Lang, 1969.

Koepke, Wulf. "Introduction." *Adelbert von Chamisso. Peter Schlemihl. Reprint of the Original Translation by Sir John Bowring and with a New Introduction by Wulf Koepke*. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1993. v-xxxi.

Kohut, Heinz. "Thomas Manns 'Tod in Venedig.' Zerfall einer künstlerischen Sublimierung." *Psycho-Pathographien. I: Schriftsteller und Psychoanalyse*. Ed. Heinz Kohut and Alexander Mitscherlich. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp, 1972. 142-67.

Korff, Hermann August. "Volkgestalten. Peter Schlemihl." *Geist der Goethezeit. Versuch einer ideellen Entwicklung der klassisch-romantischen Literaturgeschichte. Teil 4: Hochromantik*. Leipzig: 1956. 348-51.

Krauss, Wilhelmine. *Das Doppelgängermotiv in der Romantik. Studien zum romantischen Idealismus*. Nendeln FL: Kraus Reprint, 1967.

Kroeber, Hans Timotheus, ed. *Die Goethezeit in Silhouetten. 74 Silhouetten in ganzer Figur vornehmlich aus Weimar und Umgebung*. Weimar: Kiepenheuer, 1911.

Kroner, Peter A. "Adelbert von Chamisso." *Deutscher Dichter der Romantik*. Ed. Benno von Wiese. Berlin: Schmidt, 1971. 371-90.

Kunz, Reinhard. *Johann Caspar Lavaters Physiognomielehre im Urteil von Haller, Zimmermann und anderen zeitgenössischen Ärzten*. Zurich: Juris, 1970.

Kuzniar, Alice A. "Introduction." Kuzniar, *Outing Goethe* 1-32.

———, ed. *Outing Goethe and His Age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996.

———. "'Spurlos ... verschwunden': 'Peter Schlemihl' und sein Schatten als der verschobene Signifikant." *Aurora* 45 (1985): 189-204.

Labaye, Pierre. "Mythe et image de l'homme dans *Maler Nolten* de Mörike." *Images de l'homme dans le roman de formation ou Bildungsroman*. Ed. Jean-Marie Paul. Nancy:

Centre de Recherches Germaniques et Scandinaves de l'Université de Nancy II, 1995. 173-88.

Lahnstein, Peter. *Adelbert von Chamisso. Der Preuße aus Frankreich*. Munich: List, 1984.

Lange, Victor. "Stifter. *Der Nachsommer.*" *Der deutsche Roman. Vom Barock bis zur Gegenwart. Struktur und Geschichte. II. Vom Realismus bis zur Gegenwart*. Ed. Benno von Wiese. Düsseldorf, Bagel, 1965. 34-75.

Lavater, Johann Caspar. *J. C. Lavaters ausgewählte Werke*. Ed. Ernst Staehlin. Vol. 1. Zurich: Zwingli, 1943.

———. *Physiognomische Fragmente zur Beförderung der Menschenkenntnis und Menschenliebe*. Eine Auswahl mit 101 Abbildungen. Ed. Christoph Siegrist. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1984.

———. *Physiognomische Fragmente zur Beförderung der Menschenkenntniß und Menschenliebe*. 4 vols. Leipzig and Winterthur: Weidmann, Reich, and Steiner, 1775-78.

———. (John Caspar Lavater). *Essays on Physiognomy*. Trans. Thomas Holcroft. 19th ed. London: Ward, Lock, & Bowden, n.d.

Lehnert, Herbert. "Note on Mann's *Death in Venice* and the *Odyssey*." *PMLA* 80 (1965): 306-07.

Lengauer, Hubert. "Bedeutende Gebilde. Überlegungen zu einem Gemeinplatz in der Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts." *Sprachkunst. Beiträge zur Literaturwissenschaft* 6 (1975): 261-75.

Leschnitzer, Franz. "Deutung und Bedeutung des 'Peter Schlemihl.' Zu Chamissos 115. Todestag." *Die Weltbühne* 8 (1935): 1135-40.

Lichtenberg, Georg Christph. "Fragment von Schwänzen." *Aphorismen. Schriften. Briefe*. Ed. Wolfgang Promies. Munich: Hanser, 1974. 370-75.

———. "Über Physiognomik; wider die Physiognomen. Zu Beförderung der Menschenliebe und Menschenkenntnis." *Aphorismen. Schriften. Briefe*. Ed. Wolfgang Promies. Munich: Hanser, 1974. 268-307.

Liebrand, Claudia. "Identität und Authentizität in Mörikes *Maler Nolten*." *Aurora* 51 (1991-92): 105-19.

Lindau, Marie-Ursula. *Stifters 'Nachsommer'. Ein Roman der verhaltenen Rührung*. Bern: Francke, 1974.

Loeb, Ernst. "Symbol und Wirklichkeit des Schattens in Chamissos *Peter Schlemihl*." *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift: Neue Folge* 15 (1965): 398-408.

Lorey, Christoph. "'Alles ist so schön, daß es fast zu schön ist': Die sozialkritischen Motive in Adalbert Stifters Roman *Der Nachsommer*." *German Quarterly* 66.4 (1993): 477-89.

——— and John L. Plews, eds. *Queering the Canon. Defying Sights in German Literature and Culture*. Columbia, SC: Camden House, 1998.

———. "Defying Sights in German Literature and Culture: An Introduction to Queering the Canon." Lorey/Plews, *Queering the Canon* xiii-xxiv.

Lösch, E. "Das böse Princip in Göthes Faust und Chamissos Schlemihl. Eine Parallele." *Album des literarischen Vereins in Nürnberg für 1845*. 20.

Lübbe-Grothues, Grete. "Chamisso: Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte. Protokoll einer Arbeitsgemeinschaft." *Wirkendes Wort* 6 (1955/56): 301-07.

Lunding, Erik. *Adalbert Stifter, mit einem Anhang über Kierkegaard und die existentielle Literaturwissenschaft*. Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk, 1946.

MacLeod, Catriona. "Floating Heads: Weimar Portrait Busts." *Unwrapping Goethe's Weimar. Essays in Cultural Studies and Local Knowledge*. Ed. Burkhard Henke, Susanne

Kord, and Simon Richter. Columbia, SC: Camden, 2000. 65-96.

———. "The 'Third Sex' in an Age of Difference: Androgyny and Homosexuality in Winckelmann, Friedrich Schlegel, and Kleist." Kuzniar, *Outing Goethe* 194-214.

Mann, Thomas. "Chamisso" and "Peter Schlemihl." *Leiden und Größe der Meister. Gesammelte Werke in Einzelbanden. Frankfurter Ausgabe.* Ed. Peter de Mendelssohn. Frankfurt/M: Fischer, 1982. 515-38 and 538-47.

———. "Der Tod in Venedig." *Der Tod in Venedig und andere Erzählungen*. Frankfurt/M: Fischer, 1993.

———. "Lebensabriß." *Gesammelte Werke in zwölf Bänden*. Vol. 11. Frankfurt/M: Fischer, 1960. 98-144.

Manthey, Jürgen. *Wenn Blicke zeugen könnten. Eine psychohistorische Studie über das Sehen in der Literatur und Philosophie*. Munich: Hanser, 1983.

Margetts, John. "Die 'scheinbar herrenlose' Kamera. Thomas Manns 'Tod in Venedig' und die Kunstphotographie Wilhelm von Gloedens." *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 39 (1989): 326-37.

Marson, E[ric] L[awson]. *The Ascetic Artist. Prefigurations in Thomas Mann's 'Der Tod in Venedig'*. Bern: Lang, 1979.

Martens, Wolfgang. "Der Barbier in Büchners *Woyzeck*. (Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Motivgeschichte der Barbiersfigur.)" *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 79 (1960) 361-83.

Martin, Robert K. "Gender, Sexuality, and Identity in Mann's Short Fiction." Berlin 57-67.

Martini, Fritz. "Thomas Mann. *Der Tod in Venedig.*" *Das Wagnis der Sprache. Interpretationen deutscher Prosa von Nietzsche bis Benn.* Stuttgart: Klett, 1956. 176-224.

Matt, Peter von. ... *fertig ist das Angesicht. Zur Literaturgeschichte des menschlichen Gesichts*. Munich: Hanser, 1983.

Mattenklott, Gert. *Blindgänger. Physiognomische Essais*. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp, 1986.

Matthews, Boris, trans. *The Herder Symbol Dictionary. Symbols from Art, Archaeology, Mythology, Literature, and Religion*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron, 1990.

Mautner, Franz H. "Die griechischen Anklänge in Thomas Manns *Tod in Venedig*." *Monatshefte* 44 (1952): 20-26.

Mayer, G. "Adalbert Stifters *Nachsommer*. Gestaltbegriff und Werkstruktur." *Formen realistischer Erzählkunst. Festschrift for Charlotte Jolles. In Honour of Her 70th Birthday*. Ed. Jörg Thunecke. Nottingham: Sherwood, 1979. 120-27.

Mayer, Hans. *Outsiders: A Study in Life and Letters*. Trans. Dennis M. Sweet. Cambridge, MA: MIT, 1982.

Mayer, Mathias. *Eduard Mörike*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1998.

Maync, Harry. *Eduard Mörike. Sein Leben und Dichten*. Stuttgart: Cotta, 1913.

McMaster, Juliet. *The Index of the Mind: Physiognomy in the Novel*. Lethbridge, AB: University of Lethbridge Press, 1990.

McNamara, Eugene. "'Death in Venice': The Disguised Self." *College English* 24 (1962): 233-34.

Michael, Wolfgang F. "Stoff und Idee im 'Tod in Venedig.'" *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 33 (1959): 13-19.

Miller, Norbert. "Chamissos Schweigen und die Krise der Berliner Romantik." *Aurora* 39 (1979): 101-19.

Mimoso-Ruiz, Duarte. "L'Ombre e(s)t le Double: lectures du «Doppelgänger» de Chamisso à Nabokov." *Litteratures* 33 (1995): 79-91.

Mörike, Eduard. *Maler Nolten. Novelle in zwei Teilen*. Erste Fassung. Frankfurt/M: Insel, 1979.

———. *Werke*. Ed. Hannsludwig Geiger. Berlin:-Tempel, 1963.

Mosberg, Helmut. "Prolog." *Schlemihls Schatten. Geschichte einer ostpreußischen Familie*. Munich: Universitas, 1993. 9-10.

Mosse, George L. *The Image of Man. The Creation of Modern Masculinity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Müller, Günther. *Geschichte der deutschen Seele. Vom Faustbuch zu Goethes Faust*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1939.

Müller, Klaus-Detlef. "Utopie und Bildungsroman. Strukturuntersuchungen zu Stifters *Nachsommer*." *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 90 (1971): 199-228.

Musäus, Johann Karl. *Physiognomische Reisen*. Vol. 3. Altenberg: Richter, 1779.

Müssle, Hans Peter. *Chamissos Peter Schlemihl oder die Weltordnung des Teufels*. Nagoya, Jap.: Nagaya, 1961.

Nadler, Joseph. *Die Berliner Romantik 1800-1814. Ein Beitrag zur gemeinvölkischen Frage: Renaissance, Romantik, Restauration*. Berlin: Reiß, 1921.

Namowicz, Tadeusz. *Die aufklärische Utopie. Rezeption der Griechenauffassuung J. J. Winckelmanns um 1800 in Deutschland und Polen*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1978.

Nettesheim, Josefine. *Poeta Doctus oder Die Poetisierung der Wissenschaft von Musäus bis Benn*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1975.

Neubauer, Wolfgang. "Zum Schatten-Problem bei Adelbert von Chamisso oder zur Nicht-Interpretierbarkeit von 'Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte.'" *Literatur für Leser* 1 (1986): 24-34.

Neumann, Gerhard. "'... der Mensch ohne Hülle ist eigentlich der Mensch.' Goethe und Heinrich von Kleist in der Geschichte des physiognomischen Blicks." *Kleist Jahrbuch* (1988/89): 259-79.

———. "Rede, damit ich dich sehe.' Das neuzeitliche Ich und der physiognomische Blick." *Das neuzeitliche Ich in der Literatur des 18. und 20. Jahrhunderts. Zur Dialektik der Moderne. Ein internationales Symposion*. Ed. Ulrich Fülleborn and Manfred Engel. Munich: Fink, 1988. 71-108.

Neumarkt, Paul. "Chamisso's Peter Schlemihl. (A Literary Approach in Terms of Analytical Psychology.)" *Literature and Psychology* 17 (1967): 120-27.

New Encyclopædia Britannica, The. Vol. 10 (*Ready Reference. Micropædia*). 15th ed. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica, 1998.

Nicholls, Roger A. *Nietzsche in the Early Work of Thomas Mann*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1976.

Nicklas, Hans W. *Thomas Manns Novelle* Der Tod in Venedig. *Analyse des Motivzusammenhangs und der Erzählstruktur*. Marburg: Elwert, 1968.

Niekerk, Carl. "'Individuum est ineffabile': Bildung, der Physiognomikstreit und die Frage nach dem Subjekt in Goethes *Wilhelm-Meister*-Projekt." *Colloquia Germanica* 28 (1995): 1-33.

Niehaus, Michael. "Physiognomie und Literatur im 19. Jahrhundert (von Poe bis Balzac)." Campe/Schneider 411-30.

Oertel, Christine Anneliese. *An Analysis of Stifter's* Nachsommer. *In Respect to the Concept "Gestalt"*. Diss. Baltimore, 1950.

Oertel Sjögren, Christine. "Ein Musterbeispiel der Liebestheorie in Stifters 'Nachsommer.'" *Vierteljahresschrift des Adalbert Stifter Institut des Landes Oberösterreich* 26 (1977): 111-15.

———. *The Marble Statue as Idea. Collected Essays on Adalbert Stifter's 'Der Nachsommer'*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1972.

Ong, Eric Clay. *The Face of Desire*. 30 June 1999 <http://www.keepstill.com/masculinfinity/facereading.html>.

Oosterhuis, Harry, ed. *Homosexuality and Male Bonding in Pre-Nazi Germany: The Youth Movement, the Gay Movement, and Male Bonding before Hitler's Rise. Original Transcripts from "Der Eigene," the First Gay Journal in the World*. Trans. Hubert Kennedy. [*Journal of Homosexuality* 22.1/2 (1991).] New York: Haworth, 1991.

———. "The Dubious Magic of Male Beauty: Politics and Homoeroticism in the Lives and Works of Thomas and Klaus Mann." Lorey/Plews, *Queering the Canon* [1998] 181-206.

Oppenheimer, Fred E. "Auf den Spuren Gustav Aschenbachs: Schlüsselfiguren zu Gustav Aschenbach in Thomas Manns *Der Tod in Venedig*." *Studies in Modern and Classical Languages and Literature*. Ed. Fidel Lopez Criado. Madrid: Origenes, 1988. 145-53.

Parker, Kevin. "Winckelmann, Historical Difference, and the Problem of the Boy." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 25 (1992): 523-44.

Parkes, Ford B. "The Image of the Tiger in Thomas Mann's *Tod in Venedig*." *Studies in Twentieth-Century Literature* 3 (1978): 73-83.

Pausch, Holger A. and Diana Spokiene. "Walter Benjamin, Roland Barthes und die Dialektik der Modesprache im Werk Thomas Manns." *Wirkendes Wort* 49 (1999): 86-104.

Pavlyshyn, Marko. "Gold, Guilt and Scholarship: Adelbert von Chamisso's *Peter Schlemihl*." *German Quarterly* 55.1 (1982): 49-63.

Pestalozzi, Karl. "Physiognomische Methodik." *Germanistik aus interkultureller Perspektive*. Ed. Adrien Finck and Gertrud Gréciano. Strasbourg: Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, 1988. 137-53.

Péju, Pierre. "L'ombre et la vitesse." Preface. *Peter Schlemihl*. By Adelbert von Chamisso. Trans. Hippolyte von Chamisso. [Paris]: Corti, 1989. 7-93.

Pike, Burton. "Thomas Mann and the Problematic Self." *Publications of the English Goethe Society* 37 (1967): 120-42.

Pinsker, Sanford. *The Schlemiel as Metaphor. Studies in the Yiddish and American Jewish Novel*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971.

Pille, René-Marc. "*Peter Schlemihl* récit initiatique? Essai de lecture anthropologique." *Cahiers d'Études Germaniques* 21 (1991): 85-97.

Pongs, Hermann. *Das Bild in der Dichtung*. Vol 2. Marburg: Elwert'sche, 1963.

Popp, Wolfgang. *Männerliebe. Homosexualität und Literatur*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1992.

Pracht-Fitzell, Illse. "*Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte* von A. v. Chamisso in psychologischer Sicht." *Germanic Notes* 7 (1976): 2-6.

Prawer, Siegbert S. "Mignon's Revenge. A Study of Mörike's *Maler Nolten*." *Publications of the English Goethe Society* 25 (1956): 63-85.

Ragg-Kirkby, Helena. "'Äusseres, Inneres, das ist alles eins': Stifter's *Der Nachsommer* and the Problem of Perspectives." *German Life and Letters* 50.3 (1997): 323-38.

Ramondt, Marie. "Peter Schlemihl's schaduw." *Neophilologus* 34 (1950): 100-03.

Rappoport, A. S.[, ed.] *'The Marvellous History of the Shadowless Man' by A. von Chamisso and 'The Cold Heart' by Wilhelm Hauff*. London: Holden & Hardingham[, 1913].

Reed, T[erence] J[ames]. *Death in Venice. Making and Unmaking a Master*. New York: Twayne, 1994.

———. *Thomas Mann. Der Tod in Venedig. Text, Materialien, Kommentar mit den bisher unveröffentlichten Arbeitsnotizen Thomas Manns*. Munich: Hanser, 1983.

———. *Thomas Mann. The Uses of Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1974.

Rehm, Walther, ed. *Johann Joachim Winckelmann. Briefe*. 4 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1952-57.

———. *Nachsommer. Zur Deutung von Stifters Dichtung*. Munich: Lehnen, 1951.

Renner, Rolf Günter. "Schrift der Natur und Zeichen des Selbst *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte* im Zusammenhang von Chamissos Texten." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 65.4 (1991): 653-73.

Requadt, Paul. "Das Sinnbild der Rosen in Stifters Dichtung: Zur Deutung seiner Farbensymbolik." *Abhandlungen der Klasse der Literatur* 2 (1952): 17-54.

Richter, Simon. *Laocoon's Body and the Aesthetics of Pain. Winckelmann. Lessing. Herder. Moritz. Goethe*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.

———. "Winckelmann's Progeny: Homosocial Networking in the Eighteenth Century." Kuzniar, *Outing Goethe* 33-46.

Riegel, René. *Adalbert de Chamisso. Sa vie et son œuvre*. Paris: Les éditions internationales, 1934.

Riemann, Robert. *Goethes Romantechnik*. Leipzig: Seemann, 1902.

Ritter, Naomi, ed. *Thomas Mann* Death in Venice. *Complete, Authoritative Text with Biographical and Historical Contexts, Critical History, and Essays from Five Contemporary Critical Perspectives*. Boston: Bedford, 1998.

———. "A Critical History of *Death in Venice*." Ritter, *Thomas Mann* 91-109.

Rivers, Christopher. *Face Value. Physiognomical Thought and the Legible Body in Marivaux, Lavater, Balzac, Gautier, and Zola*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1994.

———. "'L'homme hiéroglyphié': Balzac, Physiognomy, and the Legible Body." Shookman, *Faces of Physiognomy* 144-60.

Rockwood, Heidi M. and Robert J. R. Rockwood. "The Psychological Reality of Myth in *Der Tod in Venedig*." *Germanic Review* 59 (1984): 137-41.

Rose, William, trans. "The Sorrows of Young Werther." By Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. *Great German Short Novels and Stories*. Ed. Victor Lange. New York: Random House, 1952. 3-99.

Roth, Norman. "'Deal gently with the young man': Love of Boys in Medieval Hebrew Poetry in Spain." *Speculum* 57 (1982): 20-51.

Rossbacher, Karlheinz. "Erzählstandpunkt und Personendarstellung bei Adalbert Stifter. Die Sicht von außen als Gestaltungsperspektive." *Vierteljahresschrift des Adalbert Stifter Institut des Landes Oberösterreich* 17 (1968): 47-58.

Rougemont, Denis de. "Chamisso et le mythe de l'ombre perdue." *Le romantisme allemand*. Ed. Albert Béguin. Paris: Bibliothèque 10 x 18, 1966. 354-66.

Rüdiger, Horst. "Winckelmanns Persönlichkeit." *Johann Joachim Winckelmann 1768 / 1968*. Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1968. 20-40.

Said, Edward W. *Representations of the Intellectual. The 1993 Reith Lectures*. New York: Pantheon, 1994.

Salm, Carola. *Reale und symbolische Ordnungen in Stifters 'Nachsommer'*. Frankfurt/M: Lang, 1991.

Saltzwedel, Johannes. *Das Gesicht der Welt. Physiognomisches Denken in der Goethezeit*. Munich: fink, 1993.

Sammons, Jeffrey L. "Fate and Psychology: Another Look at Mörike's *Maler Nolten*." *Lebendige Form: Interpretationen zur deutschen Literatur. Festschrift für Heinrich E. K. Henel*. Ed. Jeffrey L. Sammons and Ernst Schurer. Munich: Fink, 1970. 211-27.

Sauerländer, Willibald. "Überlegungen zu dem Thema Lavater und die Kunstgeschichte." *Idea. Werke. Theorien. Dokumente. jahrbuch der Hamburger Kunsthalle* 8 (1989): 15-30.

Scaff, Susan von Rohr. "Plato and Nietzsche in *Death in Venice*." Berlin 140-45.

Schaefer, Klaus and Dietrich Grohnert. "Adelbert von Chamisso." *Romantik*. Ed. Kollektiv für Literaturgeschichte im volkseigenen Verlag Volk und Wissen. Berlin: Volk und Wissen,1967. 533-57.

Schapler, Julius. *Chamissos 'Peter Schlemihl'*. Deutsch-Krone: Garms, 1893.

Scherer, Wilhelm and Oskar Walzel. *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*. 4th ed. Leipzig: Eichler, [1928].

Scheuchzer, Johann Jakob. *Joh. Jacob Scheuchzers Physica Sacra. Kupfer-Bibel In welcher Die Physica Sacra, Oder Beheiligte Natur-Wissenschaft Derer In Heil. Schrift vorkommen Natürlichen Sachen Deutlich erklärt und bewährt Von Joh. Jacob Scheuchzer*. Ed. Johann Andreas Pfeffel. Augsburg and Ulm: Christian Ulrich Wagner, 1731.

Schlaffer, Hannelore and Heinz Schlaffer. "Exkurs: Die Restauration der Kunst in Stifters

Nachsommer." *Studien zum ästhetischen Historismus*. Frankfurt/M: Suhrkamp, 1975. 112-20.

Schleucher, Kurt. *Adelbert von Chamisso*. Berlin: Stapp, 1988.

Schmidt, Ernst A. "Künstler und Knabenliebe: Eine vergleichende Skizze zu Thomas Manns *Tod in Venedig* und Vergils zweiter Ekloge." *Euphorion* 68 (1974): 437-46.

Schmitt, Stefan. "Adalbert Stifter als Zeichner." *Adalbert Stifter. Dichter und Maler, Denkmalpfleger und Schulmann. Neue Zugänge zu seinem Werk*. Ed. Hartmut Laufhütte and Karl Möseneder. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1996. 261-94.

Schmölders, Claudia. "Das Profil im Schatten. Zu eienm physiognomischen 'Ganzen' im 18. Jahrhundert." *Der ganze Mensch. Anthropologie und Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert*. Ed. Hans-Jürgen Schings. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1994. 242-59.

Schneider, Rolf. "Wirklichkeitsmärchen und Romantik. Bemerkungen zum Werk Adelbert von Chamissos." *Aufbau* 13 (1957): 203-10.

Scholl, Annette. "'Kunst! o in deine Arme wie gern entflöh' ich dem Eros!' Kunst und Künstler in Mörikes 'Maler Nolten.'" *"Der Sonnenblume gleich steht mein Gemüthe offen." Neue Studien zum Werk Eduard Mörikes (mit einer Bibliographie der Forschungsliteratur 1985-1995)*. Ed. Reiner Wild. St. Ingbert: Röhrig, 1997. 71-89.

Schößler, Franziska. *Das unaufhörliche Verschwinden des Eros. Sinnlichkeit und Ordnung im Werk Adalbert Stifters*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 1995.

Schrader, Hermann. "Chamissos Peter Schlemihl und sein Schatten." *Zeitschrift für deutsche Sprache* 7 (1894): 201-10.

Schuller, Marianne. "Das Gewitter findet nicht statt oder die Abdankung der Kunst. Zu Adalbert Stifters Roman *Der Nachsommer*." *Poetica. Zeitschrift für Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft* 10 (1978): 25-52.

Schulz, Franz. "Die erzählerische Funktion des Motivs vom verlorenen Schatten in Chamissos *Peter Schlemihl.*" *German Quarterly* 45 (1972): 429-42.

Schumacher, Hans. *Narziß an der Quelle. Das romantische Kunstmärchen: Geschichte und Interpretationen*. Wiesbaden: Athenaion, 1977.

Schüpfer, Irene. *"Es war, als 'könnte' man gar nicht reden." Die Kommunikation als Spiegel von Zeit- und Kulturgeschichte in Eduard Mörikes "Maler Nolten."* Frankfurt/M: Lang, 1996.

Schwann, Jürgen. *Vom <Faust> zum <Peter Schlemihl>. Kohärenz und Kontinuität im Werke Adelbert von Chamissos*. Tübingen: Narr, 1984.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. *Between Men. English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1985.

Seidenspinner, Wolfgang. "Jaunertracht. Zur Kleidung der Vagierenden (nach Steckbriefen)." *Schurke oder Held? Historische Räuber und Räuberbanden*. Ed. Harald Siebenmorgen. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1995. 47-55.

———. "Mobilität, Unehrlichkeit und Kriminalisierung. Zur Marginalität der jaunerischen Subkultur und ihren Entwicklungsbedingungen." *Schurke oder Held? Historische Räuber und Räuberbanden*. Ed. Harald Siebenmorgen. Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1995. 157-69.

Seidler, Herbert. *Studien zu Grillparzer und Stifter*. Vienna: Böhlaus, 1970.

Seyppel, Joachim. "Adel des Geistes: Thomas Mann und August von Platen." *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 33 (1959): 565-73.

Shookman, Ellis. "Pseudo-Science, Social Fad, Literary Wonder: Johann Caspar Lavater and the Art of Physiognomy." Shookman, *Faces of Physiognomy* 1-24.

———, ed. *The Faces of Physiognomy: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Johann Caspar Lavater*. Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture. Columbia, SC: Camden

House, 1993.

Shortland, Michael. "Skin Deep: Barthes, Lavater and the Legible Body." *Economy and Society* 14 (1985): 273-312.

Siegrist, Christoph. "'Letters of the Divine Alphabet' – Lavater's Concept of Physiognomy." Shookman, *Faces of Physiognomy* 25-39.

———. "Nachwort." *Physiognomische Fragmente zur Beförderung der Menschenkenntnis und Menschenliebe*. By Johann Caspar Lavater. Ed. Christoph Siegrist. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1984. 377-94.

Simon, Hans-Ulrich. *Mörike Chronik*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1981.

Small, Lauren. "White Frost Configurations on the Window Pane. Adalbert Stifter's *Der Nachsommer*." *Colloquia Germanica* 18 (1985): 1-17.

Sommerhage, Claus. *Eros und Poesis. Über das Erotische im Werk Thomas Manns*. Bonn: Bouvier, 1983.

Spier, Heinrich. "Chamissos 'Peter Schlemihl' in völkischer Sicht." *Zeitschrift für Deutschkunde* 54 (1940): 332-34.

Stadler, Ulrich. "Novalis und Lavater. Hardenbergs 'höhere Physiognomie' im *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*." *Physiognomie und Pathognomie. Zur literarischen Darstellung von Individualität. Festschrift für Karl Pestalozzi zum 65. Geburtstag*. Ed. Wolfram Groddeck and Ulrich Stadler. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994. 186-201.

Stafford, Barbara Maria. *Body Criticism. Imagining the Unseen in Enlightenment Art and Medicine*. Cambridge, MA: MIT, 1992.

Steakley, James D. *The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany*. New York: Arno, 1975.

———. "Iconography of a Scandal: Political Cartoons and the Eulenburg Affair in Wilhelmin Germany." *Hidden from History. Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*. Ed. Martin Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey, Jr. New York: Meridian, 1989. 233-63, 526-32.

———. "Sodomy in Enlightenment Prussia: From Execution to Suicide." *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*. Ed. Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma. New York: Harrington Park, 1989. 163-75.

Stifter, Adalbert. *Der Nachsommer. Eine Erzählung*. 4th Edition. [Munich:] Goldman, 1999.

Stillmark, Alexander. "*Per aspera ad astra*. The Secret Insignia of Stifter's *Nachsommer*." *Publications of the English Goethe Society* 59 (1989-90): 79-98.

Stoessl, Otto. *Adalbert Stifter. Eine Studie*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1925.

Stoichita, Victor I. *A Short History of the Shadow*. London: Reaktion, 1997.

Storz, Gerhard. "Maler Nolten." *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 85 (1966): 161-209.

Swales, Martin. "Mundane Magic: Some Observations on Chamisso's *Peter Schlemihl*." *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 12 (1976): 250-62.

Swales, Martin. *Thomas Mann: A Study*. London: Heinemann, 1980.

Sweet, Denis M. "The Personal, the Political, and the Aesthetic: Johann Joachim Winckelmann's German Enlightenment Life." *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*. Ed. Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma. New York: Harrington Park, 1989. 147-62.

Symington, Rodney. "The Eruption of the Other: Psychoanalytic Approaches to *Death in Venice*." Ritter, *Thomas Mann* 127-141.

Taeger, Angela. "Homosexual Love Between 'Degeneration of Human Material' and 'Love of Mankind': Demographical Perspectives on Homosexuality in Nineteenth-Century Germany." Lorey / Plews, *Queering the Canon* 20-35.

Taraba, Wolfgang F. "Nonsense Literature – and Eduard Mörike." *Modern Philology* 65 (1967-68): 233-38.

Theis, Wolfgang and Andreas Sternweiler. "Alltag im Kaiserreich und in der Weimarer Republik." *Eldorado: Homosexuelle Frauen und Männer in Berlin 1850-1950. Geschichte, Alltag und Kultur*. Exh. cat., Berlin Museum May 26 – July 8, 1984. Berlin: Frölich and Kaufmann, 1984. 48-73.

Thorndike, Lynn. *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*. 8 vols. New York, 1923-58.

Tieck, Ludwig. *Franz Sternbalds Wanderungen*. Studienausgabe mit 16 Bildtafeln. Ed. Alfred Anger. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1979.

Tielke, Martin. *Sanftes Gesetz und Historische Notwedigkeit. Adalbert Stifter zwischen Restauration und Revolution*. Frankfurt/M: Lang, 1979.

Tismar, Jens. *Gestörte Idyllen. Eine Studie zur Problematik der idyllischen Wunschvorstellungen am Beispiel von Jean Paul, Adalbert Stifter, Robert Walser und Thomas Bernhard*. Munich: Hanser, 1973.

Tobin, Robert. "The Life and Works of Thomas Mann: A Gay Perspective." Ritter, *Thomas Mann* (1998) 225-44.

———. "Why Is Tadzio a Boy? Perspectives on Homoeroticism in *Death in Venice*." *Death in Venice: A New Translation, Backgrounds and Contexts*. Trans. and ed. Clayton Koelb. New York: Norton, 1994. 207-32.

Traschen, Isadore. "The Uses of Myth in *Death in Venice*." *Thomas Mann*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea, 1986. 87-101.

Tresidder, Jack. *Dictionary of Symbols. An Illustrated Guide to Traditional Images, Icons and Emblems*. London: Duncan Baird, 1999.

Troubetzkoy, Wladimir. "L'ombre perdue de Peter Schlemihl." *Le Double, Chamisso, Dostoïevski, Maupassant, Nabokov*. Ed. Jean Bessière. Paris: Champion, 1995. 21-53.

Tscherpel, Roland. *Mörikes lemurische Possen. Die Grenzgänger der schönen Künste und ihre Bedeutung für eine dem* Maler Nolten *immanente Poetik*. Königstein: Athenäum, 1985.

Tunner, Erika. "La terrible fascination de l'ombre. Quelques réflexions sur le récit de Chamisso, *La Merveilleuse Histoire de Pierre Schlemihl*, et sur le roman de Henri Bosco, *Une Ombre*." *Chamisso. Actes des journées franco-allemandes des 30 et 31 mai 1981*. Sainte-Ménehould: Centre d'études argonnais, 1982. 149-54.

Tymms, Ralph. *German Romantic Literature*. London: Methuen, 1955.

Tytler, Graeme. *Physiognomy in the European Novel. Faces and Fortunes*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982.

Ude, Karl. "Chamisso." *Welt und Wort* 22 (1967): 368-71.

Vaget, Hans Rudolf. "*Der Tod in Venedig*." *Thomas Mann – Kommentar zu sämtlichen Erzählungen*. Munich: Winckler, 1984. 170-200.

van Stockum, Theodor C. and Jan van Dam. *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*. Vol. 2. *Vom Achtzehnten Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart*. Groningen: Wolters, 1961.

Venable, Vernon. "Structural Elements in *Death in Venice*." *Thomas Mann*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea, 1986. 23-34.

Vogelmann, Wolfgang. "Nachwort." *Maler Nolten. Novelle in zwei Teilen*. Erste Fassung. By Eduard Mörike. Frankfurt/M: Insel, 1979. 457-82.

Vogl, Joseph. "Der Text als Schleier. Zu Stifters *Der Nachsommer*." *Jahrbuch der Deutschen Schillergesellschaft* 37 (1993): 298-312.

Wagner, Karl. "'Patriarchalisches Stilleben'? Ein sozialgeschichtlicher Versuch über Stifters *Nachsommer*." *Vierteljahresschrift des Adalbert Stifter Institut des Landes Oberösterreich* 29 (1980): 139-65.

Wagner-Rieger. "Adalbert Stifter und die bildende Kunst." *Neue Beiträge zum Grillparzer- und Stifter-Bild*. Ed. Institut für Österreichkunde. Graz: Stiasny, 1965. 136-44.

Walach, Dagmar. "Adelbert von Chamisso: *Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte* (1814)." *Romane und Erzählungen der deutschen Romantik. Neue Interpretationen*. Ed. Paul Michael Lützeler. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1981. 283-301.

Walter-Schneider, Margret. "Das Licht in der Finsternis: Zu Stifters *Nachsommer*." *Jahrbuch der deutschen Schillergesellschaft* 29 (1985): 381-404.

———, Margret. "Das Unzulängliche ist das Angemessene. Über die Erzählerfigur in Stifters *Nachsommer*." *Jahrbuch der deutschen Schillergesellschaft* 34 (1990): 317-42.

Wechsler, Judith. "Lavater, Stereotype, and Prejudice." Shookman, *Faces of Physiognomy* 104-25.

Wedekind, Martina. "Adalbert Stifter: *Der Nachsommer*. Eine intertextuelle Untersuchung." *Euphorion* 89 (1995): 401-27.

Weigand, Hermann J. "Peter Schlemihl." *Surveys and Soundings in European Literature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1966. 208-22.

Weiner, Marc A. "Silence, Sound, and Song in *Der Tod in Venedig*: A Study in Psycho-Social Repression." *Seminar* 23 (1987): 137-55.

Weissberg, Liliane. "Literatur als Repräsentationsform: Zur Lektüre von Lektüre." *Vom Umgang mit Literatur und Literaturgeschichte: Positionen und Perspektive*. Ed. Lutz

Danneberg, Friedrich Vollhardt, Hartmut Böhme, and Jörg Schonert. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1992. 293-313.

Wellbery, David E. "Zur Physiognomik des Genies: Goethe/Lavater. 'Mahomeths Gesang.'" Campe/Schneider 331-56.

Wenger, Christian N. "An Introduction to the Aesthetics of Literary Portraiture." *PMLA* 50 (1935): 615-29.

White, Ann and John White. "The Devil's Devices in Chamisso's *Peter Schlemihl*: An Article in Seven-League Boots." *German Life and Letters* 45.3 (1992): 220-25.

White, Richard. "Love, Beauty, and Death in Venice." *Philosophy and Literature* 14.1 (1990): 53-64.

Whitinger, Raleigh. "Echoes of Early Romanticism in Adalbert Stifter's *Der Nachsommer*." *Monatshefte* 82 (1990): 62-72. (a)

———. "Elements of Self-Consciousness in Adalbert Stifter's *Der Nachsommer*." *Colloquia Germanica* 23 (1990): 240-52. (b)

Wiese, Benno von. "Adelbert von Chamisso: Peter Schlemihls wundersame Geschichte." *Die deutsche Novelle von Goethe bis Kafka. Interpretationen*. Düsseldorf: Bagel, 1956. 97-116.

Wildbolz, Rudolf. *Adalbert Stifter. Langeweile und Faszination*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1976.

Wilpert, Gero von. *Der verlorene Schatten: Varianten eines literarischen Motivs*. Stuttgart: Kröner, 1978.

Winckelmann, Johann Joachim. "Abhandlung von der Fähigkeit der Empfindung des Schönen in der Kunst, und dem Unterrichte in derselben." *Kleine Schriften. Vorreden. Entwürfe*. Ed. Walther Rehm. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1968. 211-33.

Wisse, Ruth R., *The Schlemiel as Modern Hero*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Wittkowski, Wolfgang. "'Daß er als Kleinod gehütet werde.' Stifters *Nachsommer*. Eine Revision." *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch* 16 (1975): 73-132.

Wöbkemeier, Rita. "Physiognomische Notlage und Metapher. Zur Konstruktion weiblicher Charaktere bei Jean Paul." *Der ganze Mensch. Anthropologie und Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert*. Ed. Hans-Jürgen Schings. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1994. 676-96.

Wühr, Wilhelm. "Der Dichter ohne Schatten." *Hochland* 38.6 (1940/41): 246-56.

Wührl, Paul-Wolfgang. *Das deutsche Kunstmärchen. Geschichte, Botschaft und Erzählstrukturen*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1984.

Wysling, Hans. "Aschenbachs Werke. Archivalische Untersuchungen an einem Thomas Mann-Satz." *Euphorion* 59 (1965): 272-314.

Zantop, Susanne. "The Beautiful, the Ugly, and the German. Race, Gender, and Nationality in Eighteenth-Century Anthropological Discourse." *Gender and Germanness. Cultural Productions of Nation*. Ed. Patricia Herminghouse and Magda Mueller. Providence: Berghahn, 1997. 21-35.

Zelle, Carsten. "Soul Semiology: On Lavater's Physiognomic Principles." Shookman, *Faces of Physiognomy* 40-63.

Zmegač, Viktor. "Zu einem Thema Goethes und Thomas Manns: Wege der Erotik in der modernen Gesellschaft." *Goethe Jahrbuch* 103 (1986): 152-67.